

Missing No. 12+  
21 & 28 March 81



# भारत का राजपत्र

## The Gazette of India

प्रारंधकार से प्रकाशित

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

25  
✓

सं० १]

नई दिल्ली, शनिवार, जनवरी ३, १९८१/पौष १३, १९०२

No. १] NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, JANUARY 3, 1981/PAUSA 13, 1902

इस भाग में बिभिन्न पृष्ठ संख्या दो जाती है जिससे कि यह अलग संकलन के रूप में रखा जा सके।  
Separate paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as a separate compilation

भाग II—खण्ड ३—उप-खण्ड (ii)

PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (II)

(ज्ञान मंत्रालय को छोड़कर) भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों और (संघ राज्यकान्त्र प्रशासनों को छोड़कर)  
केन्द्रीय प्राधिकारियों द्वारा जारी किए गए सांचिदिक आदेश और अधिसूचनाएं।

### Statutory Orders and Notifications Issued by the Ministries of the Government of India (other than the Ministry of Defence) by Central Authorities (other than the Administrations of Union Territories)

विधि, न्याय और कल्पनी कार्य मंत्रालय

(विधि कार्य विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, १ मिशन्स्ट्र, १९८०

सूचना

का० भा० १.—नोटरीज नियम, १९५६ के नियम ६ के अनुसरण  
में सकान प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री भगवती प्रसाद,  
एचओके उदयपुर, राजस्थान ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम  
४ के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे उदयपुर  
में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्त किया जाए।

2. उक्त प्राधिकारी की नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार  
का आक्षेप इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप  
में भेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं० ५(६०)/८०-न्या०]

**MINISTRY OF LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY  
AFFAIRS**

(Department of Legal Affairs)

New Delhi, the 1st, September, 1980

NOTICE

S.O. 1.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of rule 6 of the Notaries Rules, 1956, that application has been made to the said authority, under

1074 GI/80

(1)

rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Bhagwati Prasad, Advocate, Udaipur, Rajasthan for appointment as a Notary to practise in Udaipur.

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this Notice.

[No. F. 5(60)/80-Judl]

नई दिल्ली, १७ दिसम्बर, १९८०

सूचना

का० भा० २.—नोटरीज नियम, १९५६ के नियम ६ के अनुसरण  
में सकान प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री ई० एस०  
मिथा एचओके, ३२८ गुरु रामदास नगर (लस्टी नगर), दिल्ली-१२ ने  
उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम ४ के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के  
लिए दिया है कि उसे नई दिल्ली/दिल्ली में व्यवसाय करने के लिए  
नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्त किया जाए।

2. उक्त व्यक्ति की नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार  
का आक्षेप इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप  
में भेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं० ५(८२)/८०-न्या०]

एस० गुप्ता, सकान प्राधिकारी

New Delhi, the 17th December, 1980

**NOTICE**

**S.O. 2.**—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of rule 6 of the Notaries Rules, 1956, that application has been made to the said Authority, under rule 4 of the said rules by Shri D. N. Mishra, Advocate 328 Guru Ram Das Nagar (Laxmi Nagar) Delhi-92 for appointment as a Notary to practice in New Delhi/Delhi.

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within 14 days of the publication of this Notice.

[No. F. 5(82)/80-Judl.]

S. GOOPTU, Competent Authority.

**ग्रह मंत्रालय**

(कार्यिक और प्रशासनिक सुधार विभाग)

मई विली, 19 दिसम्बर, 1980

**का० आ० 3.**—दण्ड प्रक्रिया संहिता, 1973 (1974 का 2) की धारा 24 की उप-धारा (8) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, एतद्वारा, गोहाटी उच्च न्यायालय, गोहाटी में श्री श्री० एन० हुजारिका तथा अन्यों के विरुद्ध दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापना विभिन्न मामला संख्या 23/72-सी० आई० य० (पी) से उत्पन्न अधियुक्त अधिकारियों द्वारा दायर घासाधिक पुनरीक्षण याचिकाओं के संचालन के लिए श्री जी० के० तालुकवार, वरिष्ठ अधिवक्ता गोहाटी, उच्च न्यायालय को विशेष छोक अधियोजक के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[सं० 225/70/80-ए० श्री० शी०-२]

टी० के० मुख्यमण्डिन, अवर सचिव

**MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS**

(Department of Personnel & Administrative Reforms)

New Delhi, the 19th December, 1980

**S.O. 3.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (8) of Section 24 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (2 of 1974), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri G. K. Talukdar, Senior Advocate, Gauhati High Court, Gauhati, as Special Public Prosecutor for conducting the Criminal revision petitions filed by the accused persons arising out of the Delhi Special Police Establishment Regular case No. R. C. 23/72-CIU(P) against Shri B. N. Hazarika and others, in the Gauhati High Court, Gauhati.

[No. 225/70/80-A.V.D.-II]

T. K. SUBRAMANIAN, Under Secy.

**विवर मंत्रालय**

(आधिकारिक कार्य विभाग)

(भौतिक प्रभाग)

नई विली, 15 दिसम्बर, 1980

**का० आ० 4.**—बैंककारी विनियमन अधिनियम, 1949 (1949 का 10) की धारा 56 के साथ पठित धारा 53 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक की सिफारिश पर केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा घोषणा करती है कि उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 9 के उपर्यन्त इस अधिवक्ता के भारत के राजपत्र में प्रकाशित होने की तारीख से, 23 मार्च, 1983 तक की अवधि के लिए कोल्हापुर जिला मध्यवर्ती सळकारी बैंक, लिं० पर वहाँ तक लागू नहीं होंगी जहाँ तक इनका संबंध इस बैंक द्वारा गैर-ईंकिंग अस्ति अर्थात् पर्सोरी तालुका राधानगरी, जिला कोल्हापुर में निम्नलिखित अभीन जामजाव की आरिता से है।

सर्वे नं०	एकड़ गुन्हा
(1) सर्वे नं० 129	1—19
(2) सर्वे नं० 134	5—7
(3) सर्वे नं० 164	8—10
(4) सर्वे नं० 165	8—12

[सं० एक० 8/52/80-ए० सी०]

इन्वानी सेम, अवर सचिव

**MINISTRY OF FINANCE**

(Department of Economic Affairs)

(Banking Division)

New Delhi, the 15th December, 1980

**S.O. 4.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 53 read with Section 56 of the Banking Regulation Act, 1949 (10 of 1949), the Central Government, on the recommendation of the Reserve Bank of India, hereby declares that the provisions of Section 9 of the said Act shall not apply to the Kolhapur District Central Co-operative Bank Ltd., Kolhapur so far as they relate to its holding of non-banking assets viz. undenoted landed property at Panori, Taluka Radhanagari, District Kolhapur.

Survey No.	Acres Gunthas
(1) Survey No. 129	1—19
(2) -do- 134	5—7
(3) -do- 164	8—10
(4) -do- 165	8—12

for the period from the date of publication of this notification in the Gazette of India to 23rd March, 1983.

[No. F. 8/52/80-AC]

INDRANI SEN, Under Secy.

नई विली, 19 दिसम्बर, 1980

**का० आ० 5.**—बैंककारी विनियमन अधिनियम, 1949 (1949 का 10) की धारा 53 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक की सिफारिश पर, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 11 की उपधारा (2) के उपबन्धों से नेशनल बैंक आफ पाकिस्तान, कसकता तथा हुमीब बैंक लिमिटेड, बम्बई को 19 दिसम्बर 1970 के का० आ० 3949 के ग्राम्यांत दी गई छूट को एक और वर्ष की अवधि के लिए 31 दिसम्बर, 1981 तक बढ़ाते हैं।

[संख्या 15(33)-बी० श्री०-111/78]

एन० श्री० बना, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 19th December, 1980

**S.O. 5.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 53 of the Banking Regulation Act, 1949 (10 of 1949), the Central Government, on the recommendation of the Reserve Bank of India, extends for a further period of one year till the 31st December, 1981, the exemption granted in S. O. 3949 dated the 19th December, 1970 to the National Bank of Pakistan, Calcutta and the Habib Bank Ltd., Bombay from the provisions of sub-section (2) of section 11 of the said Act.

[No. 15(33)-B.O. 111/78]

N. D. BATRA, Under Secy

## केन्द्रीय उत्पादन शुल्क एवं सीमा शुल्क समाहत हा कार्यालय

मधुरई, 22 अक्टूबर, 1980

का० आ० 6.—केन्द्रीय उत्पादन शुल्क नियम, 1944 के नियम 5 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, मैं एटदारा इस समाहर्तालय के लाईसेंस जारी करने वाले प्राधिकारी, अर्थात् रेंजों के प्रभारी केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क अधीक्षकों की अपने संबंधित प्रधिकार क्षेत्र में जहाँ उत्पाद शुल्क माल का उत्पादन, संवाधान या निर्माण या उम से संबंधित पारसर्गों को निर्दिष्ट करने एवं अनुमोदन करते के लिए, उक्त नियम के नियम 9(1) में निहित समाझर्ता की शक्तियों को प्रयोग करने के लिए प्राप्तिकृत करता है।

[मं सी० ई० भार 5/80/सी० सं० 4/16/173/80-के० उ० श० 2]  
श्री० जयारामन, समाहर्ता

## OFFICE OF THE COLLECTOR OF CENTRAL EXCISE

Madurai, the 22nd October, 1980

S.O. 6.—In exercise of the powers conferred on me under rule 5 of the Central Excise Rules, 1944, I hereby authorise the licensing authorities, namely, Superintendents of Central Excise in charge of Ranges in this Collectorate to exercise in their respective jurisdiction, the powers of the Collector, under Rule 9(1) of the said Rule for specifying and approving the place where excisable goods are produced, cured or manufactured or premises appurtenant thereto.

[CER. 5/80-C. No. IV/16/173/80-CX.II]  
R. JAYARAMAN, Collector

## केन्द्रीय उत्पाद-शुल्क और सीमा-शुल्क बोर्ड

नई विलासी, 27 दिसम्बर, 1980

सीमा-शुल्क

का० आ० 7.—केन्द्रीय उत्पाद-शुल्क और सीमा-शुल्क अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 52) की धारा 9 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उत्तर प्रदेश राज्य में मथुरा परिकरणी (रिफाइनरी) को माण्डागार स्टेशन के रूप में घोषित करता है।

[प्रधि० सं० 242/का० सं० 473/88/80-सी० श०-7]  
आनन्द छाबड़ा, सचिव

## CENTRAL BOARD OF EXCISE AND CUSTOMS

New Delhi, the 27th December, 1980

## CUSTOMS

S.O. 7.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 9 of the Customs Act, 1962 (52 of 1962), the Central Board of Excise and Customs hereby declares Mathura Refinery in the State of Uttar Pradesh to be a warehousing station.

[Ntn. No. 242/F. No. 473/88/80-Cus. VII]  
A. K. CHHABRA, Secy.

## सीमा तथा केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क, कार्यालय

बंगलौर, 15 दिसम्बर, 1980

सीमा-शुल्क

का० आ० 8 —1962 के सीमा-शुल्क अधिनियम की धारा 8(अ) के अन्तर्गत, समाहर्ता सीमा-शुल्क को प्रकस्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, तथा इस कार्यालय के दिनांक 10-1-77 की अधिसूचना संख्या 1/77 सीमा-शुल्क सी० सं० 8/48/199/75 सी० श० का अधिकारण करते हुए मैं, रक्तिन्द्रिय शुल्क, समाहर्ता सीमा तथा केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क

बंगलौर इस अधिसूचना द्वारा बंगलौर हवाई अड्डे (वायु पत्तन) के सम्बन्ध में निम्नलिखित स्थानों को सीमा-शुल्क क्षेत्र के रूप में विनियित करता हूँ।

(1) हवाई अड्डे का संपूर्ण इलाका एसएमीजिसका माप उत्तर से दक्षिण तक 701—04 मीटर, और पूर्व से पश्चिम तक 4124 मीटर है तथा जिसमें टर्मिनल कम्प्लेक्स जिसका माप 51800 वर्ग मीटर, हवाई अड्डा, कान्ट्रोल टावर, रन वे, टर्मेक, पार्किंग बेस, एग्ररलाइन्स के कार्यालय बिल्डिंग, टेल संस्थान तथा अन्य इमारतें भी शामिल हैं, निम्नलिखित स्थानों से विया हुआ है:—

दक्षिण में:—छल्लाषट्टा गांव, एन० ए० रोड, बेल्सुंदर टैक एन० ए० एल० बिल्डिंग कॉम्पानी प्लॉट, येमसूर गांव हैं

उत्तर में:—मुहांगा पाल्या, कोनेनग्राहार गांव, एविएशन मैडिकल स्कूल, एन० ए० एल० फैक्टरी, बिल्डिंग 26 एग्रर फॉर्म भिपो भीर बंगलौर वरपुर रोड से घिरा है।

पूर्व में:—मार्पेहल्लि गांव से घिरा है।

पश्चिम में:—छल्लाषट्टा टैक

(2) एग्रर कार्गो केम्पलैक्स जो एम० एस० आई० एल० हौस में, एग्रर पोर्ट में दूरी पर है जिसका माप 2,900 वर्ग मीटर होता है, सर्वे नं० 3/4, कोनेना-ग्राहार गांव, बंगलौर दक्षिण तालुक में है, निम्नलिखित स्थानों से घिरा है:—

उत्तर में:—टिप्पा रेडी की भूमि

दक्षिण में:—पटेल बसपा की भूमि

पूर्व में:—एवियेशन मैडिसिन की संस्था, रखा भंगालय, भारत सरकार।

पश्चिम में:—सर्वीस रोड।

[अधिसूचना सं० 3/80(सीमा-शुल्क)/सी० सं० 8/48/257/80-सी० 2/सीमा-शुल्क]

रक्तिन्द्रिय शुल्क, समाहर्ता

OFFICE OF THE COLLECTOR OF CENTRAL EXCISE  
AND CUSTOMS

Bangalore, the 15th December, 1980

## CUSTOMS

S.O. 8.—In exercise of the powers conferred upon the Collector of Customs under section 8(b) of the Customs Act, 1962, and in supersession of this office Notification No. 1/77 Customs C. No. VIII/48/199/75-Cus. Dated 10-1-77, I, R.N. Shukla, Collector of Central Excise and Customs, Bangalore hereby specify the Customs area in respect of Bangalore Air Port as under :—

(1) The whole of the Aerodrome Area measuring North to South 701—04 Mts., East to West 4124 Mts., including the terminal complex measuring 51800 Sq. m., Air Port, Control Tower, Runways, the tramac, parking bays, Airline offices, buildings, oil installations and all structures bounded by the following :—

SOUTH : By Challaghatta Village, NAL Road, Bellunder Tank, NAL Buildings, Kempapura Village, Yemlur Village ;

NORTH : By Murugeshapalya, Konenagrahara Village, School of Aviation Medicine, H.A.L. Factory Buildings, 26 Air Force Depot and Bangalore—Varthur Road;

EAST : By Marthahalli Village;

WEST : By Challaghatta Tank;

(2) The Air Cargo Complex situated in the M.S.I.L. House situated on the Airport Road, 1/2 K.M. from the Air Port measuring 2,900 sq. mts. at Survey No. 3/4, Konena Agrahara Village, Bangalore South Taluk, bounded by the following :—

NORTH : Tippa Reddy's Land

SOUTH : Patel Basappa's Land

EAST : Institute of Aviation Medicine, Ministry of Defence, Government of India.

WEST : Service Road.

[Notification No. 3/80 (Customs)/C. No. VIII/48/257/80 C2/Cus.]

R. N. SHUKLA, Collector

(आपकर मायुसत कार्यालय, हैरियाणा)

रोहतक, 19 दिसम्बर, 1980

आपकर

का० आ० १.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार की राम है कि योक्तव्य में यह प्रावधान तथा समीचीन है कि विस्तीय वर्ष 1979-80 के दौरान यहाँ इसके पश्चात् विनिविष्ट ऐसे सभी करदाताओं के

i) जो व्यक्ति अथवा हिन्दू प्रविभक्त कुटुम्ब है, जिनकी आय दो लाख रुपये से अधिक निर्धारित की गई है, तथा

ii) जो फर्म, कम्पनियाँ, अथवा अन्य व्यक्ति संगम है, जिनकी आय दस लाख रुपये से अधिक निर्धारित की गई है।

नाम तथा उनसे सम्बन्धित अन्य विशिष्टियाँ प्रकाशित की जाएँ और यह: आपकर अधिनियम, (1961 का 43) की धारा 287 द्वारा प्रबन्ध शक्तियों तथा इस नियम उसे समर्थ बनाने वाली अन्य सभी शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार ने अपने आदेश विनांक 10 अगस्त, 1977 के द्वारा सभी आपकर आयुक्तों को विस्तीय वर्ष 1979-80 के दौरान उनके अधिकार क्षेत्र के भीतर (स्थित) करदाताओं से सम्बन्धित, नाम, पते, हैसियत तथा कर निर्धारण वर्ष तथा ऐसे करदाताओं द्वारा विवरणित आय, निर्धारित आय, देय कर तथा दिए गए कर को प्रकाशित करने के लिए अधिकृत किया है।

अतः अब केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा विनांक 10 अगस्त, 1977 के पूर्वोक्त आदेश द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, मैं, इससे संलग्न अनुमूली में उपर्युक्त करदाताओं के नाम तथा अन्य विशिष्टियाँ एवं द्वारा प्रकाशित करता हूँ।

आपकर विभाग हैरियाणा

ऐसे सभी व्यक्तियाँ तथा हिन्दू प्रविभक्त कुटुम्बों के नाम जिनकी आय विस्तीय वर्ष 1979-80 के दौरान दो लाख रुपये से अधिक निर्धारित की गई है तथा सभी फर्मों, व्यक्तिसंगम तथा कम्पनियों के नाम जिनकी आय दस लाख रुपये से अधिक निर्धारित की गई है :—

(1) हैसियत के लिए है :—‘प्राई’ व्यक्ति के लिए ‘एच’ हिन्दू प्रविभक्त परिवार के लिए ‘सी’ कम्पनी के लिए ‘एफ’ फर्म के लिए, ‘ए’ ए० औ० पी० के लिए (2) कर निर्धारण वर्ष के लिए (3) दो गई आय विवरणी के लिए (4) निर्धारित आय के लिए (5) विए जाने वाले कर के लिए है (6) किए गए कर के लिए है।

1. पोरीदस एण्ड स्पेसर (रु० के०), फरीदाबाद (1) ‘सी’  
(2) 1979-80 (3) रु० 10,11,870 (4) रु० 10,44,870  
(5) रु० 2,61,217 (6) रु० 2,61,217

2. पोरीदस एण्ड स्पेसर (पश्चिमा) लिमिटेड, फरीदाबाद (1) ‘सी’  
(2) 1977-78 (3) रु० 26,07,750 (4) रु० 52,64,947 (5)  
रु० 30,36,891 (6) रु० 27,75,646

3. मैमजं सग्सवली इण्डस्ट्रीजल सिन्डीकेट लिमिटेड, यमुनानगर (1)  
‘सी’ (2) 1977-78 (3) 2,65,01,410 (4) रु० 2,61,05,200  
(5) रु० 1,50,75,753 (6) रु० 1,50,75,753।

4. श्री एस० सी० बसा, मार्फत मैमजं बुंगरमल अमरवत्ती, यमुना-  
नगर (1) ‘आई’ (2) 1976-77 (3) रु० 3,79,530 (4)  
रु० 4,05,070 (5) 2,88,463 (6) रु० 2,14,756।

5. श्रीमति निमेल काला महाजन, मार्फत महाजन श्रीवरसीज,  
जी० टी० रोड, पानीपत (1) ‘आई’ (2) 1977-78 (3) रु० 2,35,  
197 (4) रु० 2,40,950 (5) रु० 1,36,150 (6) रु० 1,36,150।

6. श्री विश्वनाथ मार्फत गांज बुलेन इण्डस्ट्रीज, पानीपत (1)  
‘आई’ (2) 1977-78 (3) रु० 2,38,030 (4) रु० 2,44,000 (5)  
रु० 1,38,160 (6) रु० 1,38,160।

7. मैमजं बमुन्वगनाथ मार्फत दीपक बुलेन मिल्स, पानीपत (1)  
‘आई’ (2) 1977-78 (3) रु० 3,03,795 (4) रु० 3,27,940  
(5) रु० 1,93,560 (6) रु० 1,93,560।

8. श्री अशोक राज नाथ मार्फत दीपक बुलेन मिल्स, पानीपत (1)  
‘आई’ (2) 1978-79 (3) रु० 1,68,726 (4) रु० 2,41,240  
(5) रु० 1,45,295 (6) रु० 1,405,295।

9. श्री अशोक राज नाथ मार्फत दीपक बुलेन मिल्स, पानीपत (1)  
‘आई’ (2) 1977-78 (3) रु० 4,61,350 (4) रु० 4,93,200  
(5) रु० 3,02,632 (6) रु० 3,02,632।

10. श्री दीपक राज नाथ मार्फत राज बुलेन इण्डस्ट्रीज, पानीपत (1)  
‘आई’ (2) 1977-78 (3) रु० 2,85,590 (4) रु० 2,99,350  
(5) रु० 1,75,050 (6) 1,75,050।

11. श्री राजेश्वर नाथ मार्फत राज बुलेन इण्डस्ट्रीज, पानीपत (1)  
‘आई’ (2) 1977-78 (3) रु० 5,88,150 (4) रु० 6,20,180  
(5) रु० 3,86,439 (6) रु० 3,86,439।

12. श्रीमती कमल भरोज, महाजन हाऊस, पानीपत (1) ‘आई’  
(2) 1977-78 (3) रु० 1,79,150 (4) रु० 2,10,510  
(5) रु० 1,16,056 (6) रु० 1,16,056।

13. श्री विश्वनाथ मार्फत राज बुलेन इण्डस्ट्रीज, पानीपत (1)  
‘आई’ (2) 1978-79 (3) रु० 2,78,170 (4) रु० 3,24,520  
(5) रु० 1,99,998 (6) 1,99,998।

14. मिल्टन साइकिल इण्डस्ट्रीज लिमिटेड, सोनीपत (1) ‘सी’  
(2) 1977-78 (3) रु० 30,80,300 (4) रु० 31,13,260  
(5) रु० 19,61,354 (6) रु० 19,61,354।

15. पानीपत को-आपरेटिव सुगर मिल्स, लिमिटेड, पानीपत (1)  
‘ए’ (2) 1975-76 (3) रु० 10,28,162 (4) रु० 17,84,800  
(5) रु० 7,80,912 (6) रु० 7,80,912।

16. राज बुलेन इण्डस्ट्रीज, पानीपत (1) ‘एफ’ (2) 1978-79  
(3) रु० 8,98,540 (4) 10,61,720 (5) रु० 2,79,518  
(6) रु० 2,79,518।

[फा० सं० 418(1)/79-80/मुख्यालय]  
टी० आर० अम्रवाल, आपकर आयुक्त

## (Office of the Commissioner of Income Tax, Haryana)

Rohtak, the 19th December, 1980

## INCOME-TAX

**S.O. 9.**—Whereas the Central Government is of the opinion that it is necessary and expedient in the public interest to publish the names and other particulars hereinafter specified relating to assessees :—

- (i) being individual, or Hindu undivided families, who have been assessed on an income of more than two lakhs of rupees, and
- (ii) being firms, companies, or other association of persons, who have been assessed on an income of more than ten lakhs of rupees, during the financial year, 1979-80.

And whereas in exercise of the powers conferred by section 287 of the Income-tax Act (43 of 1961), and all other powers enabling them in this behalf, the Central Govt. has by its order dated 10th August, 1977, authorised all Commissioners of Income tax to publish the names, addresses, status and assessment year, relating to assesees within their jurisdiction and the income returned by, the income assessed on, the payable by, and the tax paid by, such assessee during the financial year 1979-80.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred on me by the Central Government by its aforesaid order dated 10th August, 1977, I hereby publish in the schedule, hereto annexed the names and other particulars of the assessee aforesaid.

## INCOME TAX DEPARTMENT, HARYANA, ROHTAK

Names of all individuals, and Hindu Undivided Families assessed on an income of more than Rs. two lakhs, and of all firms, Association of persons and companies assessed on an income of more than Rs. ten lakhs during the financial year 1979-80. (i) for Status, 'T' for individual, 'H' for Hindu Undivided Family, 'C' for Company, 'F' for Firm, 'A' for A.O.P; (ii) for assessment year; (iii) for income returned, (iv) for income assessed (v) for tax payable; and (vi) for tax paid.

1. Porritts & Spencer (U.K.), Faridabad (i) 'C' (ii) 1979-80 (iii) Rs. 10,44,870/- (iv) Rs. 10,44,870/- (v) Rs. 2,61,217/- (vi) Rs. 2,61,217/-.

2. Porritts and Spencer (Asia) Ltd., Faridabad (i) 'C' (ii) 1977-78 (iii) Rs. 26,07,750/- (iv) Rs. 52,64,947/- (v) Rs. 30,36,891/- (vi) Rs. 27,75,646/-.

3. M/s. Saraswati Industrial Syndicate Ltd. Yamunanagar (i) 'C' (ii) 1977-78 (iii) Rs. 2,65,01,410/- (iv) Rs. 2,61,05,200/- (v) Rs. 1,50,75,753/- (vi) Rs. 1,50,75,753/-.

4. Shri S.C. Banta c/o M/s. Ghungar Mal Amar Chand, Yamunanagar (i) 'P' (ii) 1976-77 (iii) Rs. 3,79,530/- (iv) Rs. 4,05,070/- (v) Rs. 2,88,463/- (vi) Rs. 2,14,756/-.

5. Smt. Nirmal Kanta Mahajan, C/o Mahajan Overseas, G.T. Road, Panipat (i) 'P' (ii) 1977-78 (iii) Rs. 2,35,197/- (iv) 2,40,950/- (v) Rs. 1,36,150/- (vi) Rs. 1,36,150/-.

6. Sh. Vishwa Nath c/o Raj Woollen Inds., Panipat (i) 'P' (ii) 1977-78 (iii) Rs. 2,38,030/- (iv) Rs. 2,44,000/- (v) Rs. 1,38,160/- (vi) Rs. 1,38,160/-.

7. Mrs. Vasundara Nath c/o Deepak Woollen Mills, Panipat (i) 'P' (ii) 1977-78 (iii) Rs. 3,03,795/- (iv) Rs. 3,27,940/- (v) Rs. 1,93,560/- (vi) Rs. 1,93,560/-.

8. Shri Ashok Raj Nath c/o Deepak Woollen Mills, Panipat (i) 'P' (ii) 1978-79 (iii) Rs. 1,68,726/- (iv) Rs. 2,45,240/- (v) Rs. 1,45,295/- (vi) Rs. 1,45,295/-.

9. Shri Ashok Raj Nath c/o Deepak Wollen Mills, Panipat (i) 'P' (ii) 1977-78 (iii) Rs. 4,61,350/- (iv) Rs. 4,93,200/- (v) Rs. 3,02,632/- (vi) Rs. 3,02,632/-.

10. Sh. Deepak Raj Nath c/o Raj Woollen Industries, Panipat (i) 'T' (ii) 1977-78 (iii) Rs. 2,85,590/- (iv) Rs. 2,99,350/- (v) Rs. 1,75,050/- (vi) Rs. 1,75,050/-.

11. Shri Rajeshwar Nath c/o Raj Woollen Industries, Panipat, (i) 'P' (ii) 1977-78 (iii) Rs. 5,88,150/- (iv) Rs. 6,20,180/- (v) Rs. 3,86,439/- (vi) Rs. 3,86,439/-.

12. Smt. Kamal Saroj, Mahajan House, Panipat (i) 'P' (ii) 1977-78 (iii) Rs. 1,79,150/- (iv) Rs. 2,10,510/- (v) Rs. 1,16,056/- (vi) Rs. 1,16,056/-.

13. Shri Vishwa Nath, C/o Raj Woollen Industries, Panipat (i) 'P' (ii) 1978-79 (iii) Rs. 2,78,170/- (iv) Rs. 3,24,520/- (v) Rs. 1,99,998/- (vi) Rs. 1,99,998/-.

14. Milton Cycle Industries Ltd., Sonepat (i) 'C' (ii) 1977-78 (iii) Rs. 30,80,300/- (iv) Rs. 31,13,260/- (v) Rs. 19,61,354/- (vi) Rs. 19,61,354/-.

15. Panipat Co-operative Sugar Mills Ltd. Panipat (i) 'A' (ii) 1975-76 (iii) Rs. 10,29,162/- (iv) Rs. 17,84,800/- (v) 7,80,912/- (vi) Rs. 7,80,912/-.

16. Raj Woollen Industries, Panipat (i) 'F' (ii) 1978-79 (iii) Rs. 8,98,540/- (iv) Rs. 10,61,720/- (v) Rs. 2,79,518/- (vi) Rs. 2,79,518/-.

[F. No. 418(1)/79-80/HG]  
T. R. AGGARWAL, Commissioner of Income-Tax

## धारणिय मंत्रालय

(धारणिय विभाग)

नई विलो, 27 दिसम्बर, 1980

का० आ० 10.—केन्द्रीय मरकार निर्यात (स्वासिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) प्रशिक्षियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रवत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, वायु संपीड़क का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1974 का संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात् :—

1. (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम वायु संपीड़क का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रथम दो दिन।

2. वायु संपीड़क का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1974 के नियम 6 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, अर्थात् :—

“6. निरीक्षण फीस—निर्यातकर्ता द्वारा प्रभिकरण को निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी :

(i) (क) उत्पादन के शैवाली क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति पौर्ण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु के अधीन रहने हुए पौत्र पर्यान्त नियमित मूल्य के 0.2% की दर से।

(छ) परेण्यानुमार निरीक्षण के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेण्य न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु के अधीन रहने हुए, पौत्र पर्यान्त नियमित मूल्य के 0.4% की दर से।

(ii) उन विनिर्माता नियातकर्ताओं के लिए जो राज्यों संचार और जेन्ट्रों की संबंधित सरकारों के पास लालू उद्योग एककों के द्वारा में रजिस्ट्रीकूल है, प्रति वर्ष परेण्य न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु के अधीन रहने हुए, (क) श्रीमान (ख) के लिए 0.18% तथा 0.36% की दर से दोगो ।”

[मं० 6(9) 80-निःन० तथा निः०]

टिप्पणी—का० आ० 2502 नामिक 21-9-74

## MINISTRY OF COMMERCE

## (Department of Commerce)

New Delhi, the 27th December, 1980

**S.O. 10.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Air Compressors (Quality Control and Inspector) Rules\* 1974, namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Air Compressors (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.
  - (2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.
2. In the Export of Air Compressors (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1974, for rule 6, the following rule shall be substituted namely :—

**"6. Inspection fee"**

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

- (i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2% of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4% of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18% and 0.36% for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories".

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&amp;EP]

\*Footnote :—S.O. 2502 dated 21-9-1974

**का० आ० 11.**—केन्द्रीय सरकार, नियंत्रण (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, आटोमोबाइल के पुज़ों, संघटकों तथा उपसंघटकों का नियंत्रण (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1973 का संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, प्रथमतः—

1. (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम आटोमोबाइल के पुज़ों, संघटकों तथा उपसंघटकों का नियंत्रण (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. आटोमोबाइल के पुज़ों, संघटकों का नियंत्रण (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1973 के नियम 6 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, प्रथमतः—

"6. निरीक्षण फीस—नियंत्रकर्ता द्वारा अभिकरण को निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी :

(i) (क) उत्पादन के दीगल क्वालिटी स्कीम के अधीन नियंत्रण के लिए प्रति परेण्य न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु के अधीन रहते हुए पोत पर्यंत निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2% की दर से।

(ख) परेण्यानुसार निरीक्षण के अधीन नियंत्रण के लिए प्रति परेण्य न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यंत निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4% की दर से।

(ii) उन विनिर्माता नियंत्रकर्ताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्यों की संबंधित सरकारों के पास लघु उद्योग एककों के स्वयं में रजिस्ट्रीड्हूट हैं, प्रति परेण्य न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु के अधीन रहते हुए, (क) प्रीर (ख) के लिए 0.18% तथा 0.36% की दर से होंगी।"

[सं० 6(9)/80-नि० तथा नि० ड०]

टिप्पणी—का० आ० 450, तारीख 17-2-1973

**S.O. 11.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Automobile Spares, Components and Accessories (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules\* 1973 namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Automobile Spares, Components and Accessories (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.
- (2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Export of Automobile Spares, Components and Accessories (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1973, for rule 6, the following rule shall be substituted namely :—

**"6. Inspection fee"**

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

(i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2% of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.

(b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4% of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.

(ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18% and 0.36% for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories".

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&amp;EP]

\*Footnote :—S.O. 459 dated 17-2-1973

**का० आ० 12.**—केन्द्रीय सरकार, नियंत्रण (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, साइकिलों का नियंत्रण (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1967 का संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती हैं, प्रथमतः—

1. (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम साइकिलों का नियंत्रण (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. साइकिलों का नियंत्रण (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1967 के नियम 7 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, प्रथमतः—

"7. निरीक्षण फीस—नियंत्रकर्ता द्वारा अविकरण को निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी :

(i) (क) उत्पादन के दीगल क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन नियंत्रण के लिए प्रति परेण्य न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु के अधीन रहते हुए पोत पर्यंत निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2% की दर से।

(ख) परेण्यानुसार निरीक्षण के अधीन नियंत्रण के लिए प्रति परेण्य न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यंत निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4% की दर से।

(ii) उन विनिर्माता नियंत्रकर्ताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्यों की संबंधित सरकारों के पास लघु उद्योग एककों के रूप में रजिस्ट्रीड्हूट हैं, प्रति परेण्य न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु के अधीन रहते हुए, (क) प्रीर (ख) के लिए 0.18% तथा 0.36% की दर से होगी।"

[सं० 6(9)/80-नि० तथा नि० ड०]

टिप्पणी—का० आ० 4357, तारीख 5-12-1967

**S.O. 12.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Bicycles (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules,\* 1967, namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Bicycles (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.
- (2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.
2. In the Export of Bicycles (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1967, for rule 7, in following rule shall be substituted namely :—

#### “7. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

- (i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2% of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4% of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18% and 0.36% for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories".

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

\*Footnote :—S.O. 4357, dated 4-12-1967

**का० आ० 13 :**—केन्द्रीय सरकार, नियर्ति (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शर्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, चमकदार इस्पात की छड़ों का नियर्ति (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1973 का संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात् :—

1. (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम चमकदार इस्पात की छड़ों का नियर्ति (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. चमकदार इस्पात की छड़ों का नियर्ति (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1973 के नियम 6 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, अर्थात् :—

“6. निरीक्षण फीस—नियर्तिकर्ता द्वारा अभिकरण को निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी :

- (i) (क) उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन नियर्ति के लिए प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु. के अधीन रहते हुए पोत पर्यन्त नियर्ति निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2% की दर से।
- (ख) परेषणानुसार निरीक्षण के अधीन नियर्ति के लिए प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु. के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4% की दर है।

- (ii) उन विनिर्माता नियर्तिकर्ताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों की संबंधित सरकारों के पास लघु उच्चोग एकांकों के रूप में रजिस्ट्रीड्ड हैं, प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु. के अधीन रहते हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18% तथा 0.36% की दर से होंगी।

[सं० 6(9)/80-नि० नियंत्रण निं० ३०]

टिप्पणी—का० आ० 1622 तारीख 9-6-1973

**S.O. 13.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Bright Steel Bars (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules,\* 1973, namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Bright Steel Bars (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.
- (2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.
2. In the Export of Bright Steel Bars (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1973, for rule 6, in following rule shall be substituted namely :—

#### “6. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

- (i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2% of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4% of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18% and 0.36% for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories".

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

\*Footnote :—S.O. 1622, dated 9-6-1973.

**का० आ० 14 :**—केन्द्रीय सरकार, नियर्ति (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शर्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, ब्लैंड लोहे के मलबाल तथा फिटिंग्स का नियर्ति (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1971 का संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात् :—

1. (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम ढाले हुए लोहे के मलबाल तथा फिटिंग्स का नियर्ति (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. ढाले हुए लोहे के मलबाल तथा फिटिंग्स का नियर्ति (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1971 के नियम 6 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, अर्थात् :—

“6 निरीक्षण फीस—नियर्तिकर्ता द्वारा अभिकरण को निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी .

(i) (क) उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन नियर्ति के लिए प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु. के सधीन रहने हुए पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2% की दर से।

(ख) परेषणानुसार निरीक्षण के अधीन नियर्ति के लिए प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु. के सधीन रहने हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4% की दर से।

(ii) उन विनिर्माता नियर्तिकर्ताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों की संबंधित सरकारों के पास लघु उच्चोग एकांकों के रूप में रजिस्ट्रीड्ड हैं, प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु. के सधीन रहते हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18% तथा 0.36% की दर से होंगी।

[सं० 6(9)/80-नि० नियंत्रण निं० ३०]

टिप्पणी—का० आ० 1916 तारीख 6-5-1973

**S.O. 14**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Cast Iron Soil Pipes and Fittings (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules,\* 1971 namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Cast Iron Soil Pipes and Fittings (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.
- (2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Export of Cast Iron Soil Pipes and Fittings (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1971, for rule 6, in following rule shall be substituted namely :—

#### “6. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

- (i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2% of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4% of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18% and 0.36% for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories.”

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

\*Footnote :—S.O. 1916, dated 6-5-1971.

**का० आ० 15**—केन्द्रीय सरकार, नियंत्रण (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रवस्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग उन्हें हुए, हले हुए लोहे के मैनहोल कबर तथा फ्रेम का नियंत्रण (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1971 का संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, ग्रथात् :—

1. (1) इन नियमों का मंजिल नाम छले हुए लोहे के मैनहोल कबर फ्रेम का नियंत्रण (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रदूष होंगे।

2. छले हुए लोहे के मैनहोल कबर तथा फ्रेम का नियंत्रण (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1971 के नियम 6 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, ग्रथात् :—

“6 निरीक्षण फीस—नियंत्रकर्ता द्वारा अभिकरण को निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुमार दी जाएगी :

(i) (क) उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन नियंत्रण के लिए प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपा) 20 रु के अधीन रहने हुए पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2% की दर में।

(ख) परेषणानन्दार निरीक्षण के अधीन नियंत्रण के लिए प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपा) 20 रु के अधीन रहने हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4% की दर में।

(ii) उन विनिर्माता नियंत्रकर्ताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्य भेजों की संविधित सरकारों के पास लाभु उद्योग एकांकों के स्पष्ट में रजिस्ट्रीकूर हैं, प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपा) 20 रु के अधीन रहने हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18% तथा 0.36% की दर से होंगी।

[मा० 6(9)/80-नि० तथा मि० उ०]

टिप्पणी—का० आ० 2155, तारीख 28-5-1971

**S.O. 15**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Cast Iron Manhole Covers and Frames (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules,\* 1971 namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Cast Iron Manhole Covers and Frames (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.
- (2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.
2. In the Export of Cast Iron Manhole Covers and Frame (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1971, for rule 6, in following rule shall be substituted namely :—

#### “6. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

- (i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2% of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4% of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18% and 0.36% for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories.”

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

\*Footnote.—S.O. 2155, dated 28-5-1971.

**का० आ० 16**—केन्द्रीय सरकार, नियंत्रण (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रवस्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हए, छले हुए लोहे से बने नालों का नियंत्रण (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1977 का संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, ग्रथात् :—

1. (1) इन नियमों का मंजिल नाम छले हुए लोहे से बने नालों का नियंत्रण (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 का है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रदूष होंगे।

2. छले हुए लोहे से बने नालों का नियंत्रण (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1977 के नियम 7 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, ग्रथात् :—

“7. निरीक्षण फीस—नियंत्रकर्ता द्वारा अभिकरण को निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुमार दी जाएगी :

(i) (क) उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन नियंत्रण के लिए प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपा) 20 रु के अधीन रहने हुए पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2% की दर से।

(ख) परेषणानन्दार निरीक्षण के अधीन नियंत्रण के लिए प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपा) 20 रु के अधीन रहने हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4% की दर से।

(ii) उन विनिर्माता नियंत्रकर्ताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्य भेजों की संविधित सरकारों के पास लाभु उद्योग एकांकों के स्पष्ट में रजिस्ट्रीकूर हैं, प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपा) 20 रु के अधीन रहने हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18% तथा 0.36% की दर से होंगी।

[स० 6(9)/80-नि० तथा मि० उ०]

टिप्पणी—का० आ० 1270, तारीख 30-4-1977

S.O. 15.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Cast Iron Spun Pipes (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1977, namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Cast Iron Spun Pipes (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.
- (2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.
2. In the Export of Cast Iron Spun Pipes (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1977, for rule 7, in following rule shall be substituted namely :—

#### “7. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

- (i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2% of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4% of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18% and 0.36% for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories.”

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

\*Footnote.—S O 1270, dated 30-4-1977.

का० अ० 17—केन्द्रीय सरकार, नियंत्रित (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शब्दियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, डोजर इतरों का नियंत्रित (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1967 का संगोचन करते के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बदली है, अर्थात् :—

- (1) इन नियमों का सक्षित नाम डोजर इजिनो का नियंत्रित (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संगोचन नियम, 1980 है।
- (2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।
2. डोजर इजिनो का नियंत्रित (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1967 के नियम 7 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, अर्थात् :—
  - (7) निरीक्षण कोसि—नियंत्रित द्वारा असिकरण को निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी :
    - (i) (क) उत्पदन के दीरात क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्फीम के अधीन नियंत्रित के लिए प्रति परेवण न्यूनतम (वीस रुपए) 20 रु. के अधीन रहते हुए पोत पर्यन्त नि शुल्क मूल्य के 0.2 प्रतिशत की दर से।
    - (ख) परेवण नुगार निरीक्षण के अधीन नियंत्रित के लिए प्रति परेवण न्यूनतम (वीस रुपए) 20 रु. के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यन्त नि शुल्क मूल्य के 0.4 प्रतिशत की दर से।
    - (ii) उन विनिर्माता नियंत्रितकर्ताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्य अधीनों की सम्बन्धित सरकारों के पास लघु उद्योग एककों के रूप में रजिस्ट्रीड्यूट हैं, प्रति परेवण न्यूनतम (वीस रुपए) 20 रु. के अधीन रहते हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18 प्रतिशत तथा 0.36 प्रतिशत की दर से होंगी।

टिप्पणी—का० 3207, तारीख 7-10-1967

[सं 6(9)/80-नि० न्या नि० उ०]

S.O. 17.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Diesel Engines (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1967 namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Diesel Engines (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.
- (2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.
2. In the Export of Diesel Engines (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1967, for rule 7, in following rule shall be substituted namely :—

#### “7. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

- (i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2% of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4% of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18% and 0.36% for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories.”

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

\*Footnote :—S O 3207, dated 7-10-1967.

का० अ० 18—केन्द्रीय सरकार, नियंत्रित (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 18 द्वारा प्रदत्त शब्दियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, घरेलू प्रतिक का नियंत्रित (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1974 का संगोचन करते के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात् --

- (1) इन नियमों का सक्षित नाम घरेलू प्रतिक का नियंत्रित (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संगोचन नियम, 1980 है।
- (2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।
- 2 घरेलू प्रतिक का नियंत्रित (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1974 के नियम 6 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, अर्थात् :—
  - (6) निरीक्षण फीस—नियंत्रित द्वारा असिकरण को नियंत्रित फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी :—
    - (i) (क) उत्पदन के दीरात क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्फीम के अधीन नियंत्रित के लिए प्रति परेवण न्यूनतम (वीस रुपए) 20 रु. के अधीन रहते हुए पोत पर्यन्त नि शुल्क मूल्य के 0.2 प्रतिशत की दर से।
    - (ख) परेवण नुगार निरीक्षण के अधीन नियंत्रित के लिए प्रति परेवण न्यूनतम (वीस रुपए) 20 रु. के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यन्त नि शुल्क मूल्य के 0.4 प्रतिशत की दर से।
    - (ii) उन विनिर्माता नियंत्रितकर्ताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्य अधीनों की सम्बन्धित सरकारों के पास लघु उद्योग एककों के रूप में रजिस्ट्रीड्यूट हैं, प्रति परेवण न्यूनतम (वीस रुपए) 20 रु. के अधीन रहते हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18 प्रतिशत तथा 0.36 प्रतिशत की दर से होंगी।

[मं 6(9)/80-नि० न्या नि० उ०]

टिप्पणी—का० 2351, तारीख 14-9-1974

**S.O 18** In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Domestic Refrigerators (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules\* 1974 namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Domestic Refrigerators (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2 In the Export of Domestic Refrigerators (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1974, for rule 6, in following rule shall be substituted namely :—

#### "6. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

(b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.2% of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.

(h) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4% of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.

(ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18% and 0.36% for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories".

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

\*Footnote :—S.O. 2351 dated 14-9-1974.

**का० आ० 19** —केन्द्रीय सरकार, नियंति (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) प्रधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, एकल बैटरीयों का नियंति (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1978 का मंशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनायी है, इसका —

1. (1) इन नियमों का मध्यम से वैर्यांशों का नियंति (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) मंशोधन नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये ग्राहपत्र से प्रथमान की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2 एकल बैटरीयों का नियंति (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1978 के नियम 5 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम द्वारा जापान, अर्थात् —

"(5) नियंत्रण कीस —नियंत्रित द्वारा अभिकरण को निरीक्षण कीम निम्नलिखित के अनुमान द्वारा जापानी।

(i) (क) उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन नियंति के लिए प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीम रूपाएँ) 20 रु के अधीन रहने हुए पात्र पर्याम निशुल्क मूल्य 0.2 प्रतिशत की दर से।

(क) परेषणानुमान निरीक्षण के अधीन नियंति के लिए प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीम रूपाएँ) 20 रु के प्रधान रहने हुए पात्र पर्याम निशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4 प्रतिशत की दर से।

(ii) इन विनियमों नियंत्रित विद्युतीयों के लिए जो गत्यों/मध्य गत्यों की गवायित सरकारी के पास लघु उत्पाद एकाको के स्पष्ट से रजिस्ट्रीकृत है, प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीम रूपाएँ) 20 रु के स्थान पर्याम द्वारा हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18 प्रतिशत तथा 0.36 प्रतिशत की दर से होंगी।'

[स० 6(9)/80-नि० निः० आ० नि० ३०]

मित्र—का० आ० 1107, २५ अ० ३-६-१९७४

**S.O 19**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Dry Batteries (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules\* 1978 namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Dry Batteries (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Export of Dry Batteries (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1978, for rule 5, in following rule shall be substituted namely :—

#### "5. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

(i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2% of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.

(b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4% of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.

(ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18% and 0.36% for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories".

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

\*Footnote :—S.O. 1607 dated 3-6-1978.

**का० आ० 20** —केन्द्रीय सरकार, नियंति (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) प्रधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए, विचाल केबिल और कडकटर का नियंति (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1968 का मंशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनायी है, अर्थात्—

1 (1) इन नियमों का मध्यम से विचाल केबिल और कडकटर का नियंति (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) मंशोधन नियम, 1990 है।

(2) ये ग्राहपत्र से प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2 विचाल केबिल और कडकटर का नियंति (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1968 के नियम 7 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम, द्वारा जापान, अर्थात्—

"(7) नियंत्रण कीस —नियंत्रित द्वारा अभिकरण का निरीक्षण कीस निम्नलिखित के अनुमान द्वारा होगी।

(i) (क) उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन नियंति के लिए प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीम रूपाएँ) 20 रु के अधीन रहने हुए पात्र पर्याम निशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2% की दर से।

(ख) परेषणानुमान निरीक्षण के अधीन नियंति के लिए प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीम रूपाएँ) 20 रु के अधीन रहने हुए पात्र पर्याम निशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4% की दर से।

(ii) इन विनियमों नियंत्रित विद्युतीयों के लिए जो गत्यों/मध्य गत्यों की मध्यविधि सरकारी के पास लघु उत्पाद एकाको के स्पष्ट से रजिस्ट्रीकृत है, प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीम रूपाएँ) 20 रु के अधीन रहने हुए (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18% तथा 0.36% की दर से होंगी।'

[स० 6(9)/80-नि० निः० आ० नि० ३०]

त्रिपुरा: का० आ० 3193 लार्ड्श 27-५-1968

**S.O. 20.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Electric Cables and Conductor (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1968 namely :

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Electric Cables and Conductors (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Export of Electric Cables and Conductor (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1968, for rule 7, in following rule shall be substituted namely :

#### 7. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

(i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2% of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.

(b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4% of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.

(ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18% and 0.36% for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories".

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

\*Footnote :—S.O. 3493, dated 27-9-1968.

**कानून 21.**—केन्द्रीय सरकार नियंत्रित (क्रान्तिकारी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, विज्ञान के लैप तथा ट्रूपों का नियंत्रित (क्रान्तिकारी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1978 का संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनायी हैं, अबास् ।

1. (1) इन नियमों का महिला नाम विज्ञान के लैप तथा ट्रूपों का नियंत्रित (क्रान्तिकारी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन, नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तरीक्षा में प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. विज्ञान के लैप तथा ट्रूपों का नियंत्रित (क्रान्तिकारी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1978 के नियम 7 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम आगा, अवश्य :—

"7. नियंत्रण फीस.—नियंत्रित कर्ता द्वारा अभिकरण का नियंत्रण कीमत निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी :

(1) (क) उत्पादन के बौद्धन क्रान्तिकारी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन नियंत्रित के लिए प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीम रूपा) 20 रु. के अधीन रहते हुए पौत्र पर्यंत निष्कृत मूल्य के 0.2% की दर से।

(ख) परेषणात्मक नियंत्रण के अधीन नियंत्रित के लिए प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीम रूपा) 20 रु. के अधीन रहते हुए पौत्र पर्यंत निष्कृत मूल्य के 0.1% की दर से।

(2) उन विनियमों नियंत्रितकर्ताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों की सम्बन्धित सरकारों के पास लम्ह उत्पादन एककों के लिए रजिस्ट्रेशन है, प्रांत परेषण न्यूनतम (बीम रूपा) 20 रु. के अधीन रहते हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18% तथा 0.36% की दर से होंगी।"

[मा. 6(9)/80-नियंत्रित नियम 3]

टिप्पणी : कानून 1609 तारीख 3-6-1967

**S.O. 21.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Electric Lamps and Tubes (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1978 namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Electric Lamps and Tubes (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Export of Electric Lamps and Tubes (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1978, for rule 7, in following rules shall be substituted namely :

#### 7. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

(i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2% of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.

(b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4% of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.

(ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18% and 0.36% for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories".

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

\*Footnote :—S.O. 1609 dated 3-6-1978.

**कानून 22.**—केन्द्रीय सरकार, नियंत्रित (क्रान्तिकारी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, विज्ञान के लैप तथा ट्रूपों का नियंत्रित (क्रान्तिकारी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1967 का संशोधन करने के लिए नियंत्रित नियम बनायी है, अवश्य ।

1. (1) इन नियमों का महिला नाम विज्ञान के प्रांतों का नियंत्रित (क्रान्तिकारी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र का तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. विज्ञान के प्रांतों का नियंत्रित (क्रान्तिकारी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1967 के नियम 7 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम राजा जाग्या, अवश्य :—

"7. नियंत्रण फीस.—नियंत्रित कर्ता द्वारा अभिकरण का नियंत्रण कीमत निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी :

(1) (क) उत्पादन के बौद्धन क्रान्तिकारी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन नियंत्रित के लिए प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीम रूपा) 20 रु. के अधीन रहते हुए पौत्र पर्यंत निष्कृत मूल्य के 0.2% की दर से।

(ख) परेषणात्मक नियंत्रण के अधीन नियंत्रित के लिए प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीम रूपा) 20 रु. के अधीन रहते हुए पौत्र पर्यंत निष्कृत मूल्य के 0.1% की दर से।

(2) उन विनियमों नियंत्रित कर्ताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों की सम्बन्धित सरकारों के पास लम्ह उत्पादन एककों के लिए रजिस्ट्रेशन है, प्रांत परेषण न्यूनतम (बीम रूपा) 20 रु. के अधीन रहते हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18% तथा 0.36% की दर से होंगी।"

[मा. 6(9)/80-नियंत्रित नियम 3]

टिप्पणी : कानून 3215 तारीख 7-9-1967

**S.O. 22.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Electric Fans (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules\* 1967 namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Electric Fans (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Export of Electric Fans (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1967, for rule 7, in following rule shall be substituted namely :

#### “7. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

(i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2% of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.

(b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4% of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.

(ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18% and 0.36% for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories".

[F. No. 6(9)/80-El&EP]

\*Footnote :—S.O. 3215 dated 7-9-1967.

**का० आ० 23 :**—केन्द्रीय सरकार, नियंति (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, तामचीनी के बत्तों का नियंति (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1978 का संशोधन करते के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, इथति :—

1. (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम तामचीनी के बत्तों का नियंति (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. तामचीनी के बत्तों का नियंति (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1978 के नियम 7 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा अधिकृत :—

“7. निरीक्षण फीस :—नियंतकर्ता द्वारा अभिकरण को निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी :

(1) (क) उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन नियंति के लिए प्रति परेपण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु के अधीन रहते हुए पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2% की दर से।

(ख) परेपणानुसार निरीक्षण के अधीन नियंति के लिए प्रति परेक्षण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4% की दर से।

(2) उन विनिर्माण नियंतकर्ताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्य एवं भौतों की संबंधित सरकारों के पास लूप उद्यग एककों के रूप में ज़िक्र है, प्रति परेपण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 12 रु के अधीन रहते हुए, (6) और (ख) के लिए 0.18% तथा 0.36% की दर से होगी।”

[सं० 6(9)/80-निं० तथा नि० उ०]

टिप्पणी : का० आ० 2910 तारीख 30-8-1978

**S.O. 23.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Enamel Wares (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules\* 1978 namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Enamel Wares (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Export of Enamel Wares (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1978 for rule 7, in following rule shall be substituted namely :

#### “7. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

(i) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.

(2) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.

(ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18 per cent and 0.36 per cent for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories".

[F. No. 6(9)/80 El&EP]

\*Footnote :—S.O. 2910 dated 30th August, 1978

**का० आ० 24 :**—केन्द्रीय सरकार, नियंति (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, विस्तारित धातुओं की इस्पात की चद्वारों का नियंति (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1980 का संशोधन करते के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अधिकृत :—

1. (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम विस्तारित धातुओं की इस्पात की चद्वारों का नियंति (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. विस्तारित धातुओं की इस्पात की चद्वारों का नियंति (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1967 के नियम 7 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा अधिकृत :—

“7. निरीक्षण फीस :—नियंतकर्ता द्वारा अभिकरण को निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी :

(1) (क) उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन नियंति के लिए प्रति परेपण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2% की दर से।

(ख) परेपणानुसार निरीक्षण के अधीन नियंति के लिए प्रति परेपण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4% की दर से।

(2) उन विनिर्माण नियंतकर्ताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्य एवं भौतों की संबंधित सरकारों के पास लूप उद्यग एककों के रूप में ज़िक्र है, प्रति परेपण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 12 रु के अधीन रहते हुए, (6) और (ख) के लिए 0.18% तथा 0.36% की दर से होगी।”

[सं० 6(9)/80-निं० तथा नि० उ०]

टिप्पणी : का० आ० 4575 तारीख 19-12-1967

**S.O. 24.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Expanded Metal Steel Sheets (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules\* 1967, namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Expanded Metal Steel Sheets (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Export of Expanded Metal Steel Sheets (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1967, for rule 7, in following rule shall be substituted namely :

#### "7. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

- (i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18 per cent and 0.36 per cent for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories."

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

\*Footnote:—S.O. 4575, dated 19-12-1967.

**का० आ० 25.**—केन्द्रीय सरकार, नियंत्रित (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शर्कियों का प्रयोग करने द्वारा, कॉलकोट का नियंत्रित (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम\* 1973 का संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात् :—

1. (1) इन नियमों का मध्यस्थ नाम कीलकों का नियंत्रित (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. कीलकों का नियंत्रित (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1978 के नियम 6 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम द्वारा जाएगा, अर्थात् :—

"6 निरीक्षण फीस:—नियंत्रित द्वारा अभिकरण को निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी :

(1) (क) उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन नियंत्रित के लिए प्रति परेण्य न्यूनतम (बीस रुपा.) 20 रु. के अधीन रहने हुए पौत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2% की दर से।

(ख) परेण्यानुसार निरीक्षण के अधीन नियंत्रित के लिए प्रति परेण्य न्यूनतम (बीस रुपा.) 20 रु. के अधीन रहने हुए पौत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4% की दर से।

(2) उन विनिर्माता नियंत्रिकार्ताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्य शेक्सों की संबंधित सरकारों के पाम लघु उच्चोग एडकों के स्पष्ट में रजिस्ट्रीकूत हैं, प्रति परेण्य न्यूनतम (बीस रुपा.) 20 रु. के अधीन रहने हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18% तथा 0.36% की दर से होंगी।"

[गो 6(9)/80-गो 6(9) तथा गो 30]

\*टिप्पणी :—का० आ० 1511, शारीर्य 27-5-1978।

**S.O. 25.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Fasteners (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules\* 1978, namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Fasteners (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Export of Fasteners (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1978, for rule 6, in following rule shall be substituted namely :

#### "6. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

- (i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18 per cent and 0.36 per cent for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories."

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

\*Footnote :—S.O. 1511, dated 27-5-1978.

**का० आ० 26.**—केन्द्रीय सरकार, नियंत्रित (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शर्कियों का प्रयोग करने द्वारा, अण्डीयों का नियंत्रित (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम\* 1978 का संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात् :—

1. (1) इन नियमों का संभित नाम अण्डीयों का नियंत्रित (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. अण्डीयों का नियंत्रित (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1978 के नियम 7 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम द्वारा जाएगा, अर्थात् :—

"7. निरीक्षण फीस:—नियंत्रित द्वारा अभिकरण को निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी :

(1) (क) उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन नियंत्रित के लिए प्रति परेण्य न्यूनतम (बीस रुपा.) 20 रु. के अधीन रहने हुए पौत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2% की दर से।

(ख) परेण्यानुसार निरीक्षण के अधीन नियंत्रित के लिए प्रति परेण्य न्यूनतम (बीस रुपा.) 20 रु. के अधीन रहने हुए पौत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4% की दर से।

(2) उन विनिर्माता नियंत्रिकार्ताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्य शेक्सों की संबंधित सरकारों के पाम लघु उच्चोग एडकों के स्पष्ट में रजिस्ट्रीकूत हैं, प्रति परेण्य न्यूनतम (बीस रुपा.) 20 रु. के अधीन रहने हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18% तथा 0.36% की दर से होंगी।"

[गो 6(9)/80-गो 6(9) तथा गो 30]

\*टिप्पणी :—का० आ० 2139, शारीर्य 22-7-1978।

**S.O. 26.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Flash Lights (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules\* 1978, namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Flash Lights (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Export of Flash Lights (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1978, for rule 7, in following rule shall be substituted namely :

#### "7. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

(i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.

(b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.

(ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18 per cent and 0.36 per cent for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories."

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

\*Footnote:—S.O. 2139, dated 22-7-1978.

**का० आ० 27.**—केन्द्रीय सरकार, नियंत्रित क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, अधिकारिक जंजीरों का नियंत्रित (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम\* 1978 का संशोधन करते के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात् :—

1. (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम अधिकारिक जंजीरों का नियंत्रित (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये गतिवर्त में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. अधिकारिक जंजीरों का नियंत्रित (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1978 के नियम 7 के स्थान पर, निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, अर्थात् :—

7. निरीक्षण फीस :—नियंत्रकर्ता द्वारा अभिकरण को निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी :

(1) (क) उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन नियंत्रित के लिए प्रति परेण्य न्यूनतम (बीम रुपए) 20 रु के अधीन रहते हुए, पांच पर्यावर्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2% की दर से।

(ख) परेण्यानुसार निरीक्षण के अधीन नियंत्रित के लिए प्रति परेण्य न्यूनतम (बीम रुपए) 20 रु के अधीन रहते हुए, पांच पर्यावर्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4% की दर से।

(2) उन विनिर्माता नियोनेशनों के लिए जो राज्यों/नियंत्रण शक्तियों की सम्बन्धित सरकारों के पास लघु उच्चाग एकांकों से रुप में रजिस्ट्रीड हैं, प्रति परेण्य न्यूनतम (बीम रुपए) 20 रु के अधीन रहते हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18% तथा 0.36% की दर से होंगी।

[मा० ६(९)/८०-११० नि० तथा नि० उ०]

\*टिप्पणी :—का०आ० 1659, तारीख 10-6-1978।

**S.O. 27.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Industrial Chains (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules\* 1978 namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Industrial Chains (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Export of Industrial Chains (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1978, for rule 7, in following rule shall be substituted namely :

#### "7. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

(i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.

(b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.

(ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18 per cent and 0.36 per cent for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories."

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

\*Footnote:—S.O. 1659, dated 10-6-1978.

**का० आ० 28.**—केन्द्रीय सरकार, नियंत्रित (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने द्वारा, लघु अधिकारिक उत्पाद का नियंत्रित (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम\* 1976 का संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात् :—

1. (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम लघु अधिकारिक उत्पाद का नियंत्रित (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. लघु अधिकारिक उत्पाद का नियंत्रित (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1976 के नियम 6 के स्थान पर, निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, अर्थात् :—

6. निरीक्षण फीस :—नियंत्रिकर्ता द्वारा अभिकरण को निरीक्षण पीम निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी :

(1) (क) उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन नियंत्रित के लिए प्रति परेण्य न्यूनतम (बीम रुपए) 20 रु के अधीन रहते हुए, पांच पर्यावर्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2% की दर से।

(ख) परेण्यानुसार निरीक्षण के अधीन नियंत्रित के लिए प्रति परेण्य न्यूनतम (बीम रुपए) 20 रु के अधीन रहते हुए, पांच पर्यावर्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4% की दर से।

(2) उन विनिर्माता नियोनेशनों के लिए जो राज्यों/नियंत्रण शक्तियों की सम्बन्धित सरकारों के पास लघु उच्चाग एकांकों के रुप में रजिस्ट्रीड हैं, प्रति परेण्य न्यूनतम (बीम रुपए) 30 रु के अधीन रहते हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18% तथा 0.36% की दर से होंगी।

[मा० ६(९)/८० नि० तथा नि० उ०]

\*टिप्पणी :—का०आ० 894, तारीख 21-2-1976।

**S.O. 28.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Light Engineering Products (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules<sup>\*</sup> 1976, namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Light Engineering Products (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Export of Light Engineering Products (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1976, for rule 6, in following rule shall be substituted namely :

#### "6. Inspection fee"

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

- (i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18 per cent and 0.36 per cent for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories."

[F. No. 6(9)/80-FI&EPI]

\*Footnote :—S.O. 894, dated 21-2-1976.

**कांग्रेस 29.**—केन्द्रीय सरकार, नियान्ति (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए, पाइप फिटिंग्सों का नियान्ति (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम \* 1977 का मंशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात् :—

1. (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम पाइप फिटिंग्सों का नियान्ति (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) मंशोधन नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. पाइप फिटिंग्सों का नियान्ति (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1977, के नियम 6, के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा अर्थात् :—।

"6. निरीक्षण फीस :—नियान्तिकर्ता द्वारा अभिकरण को नियान्ति कीम निम्नलिखित के अनुसार की जाएगी :

(1) (क) उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी, नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन नियान्ति के लिए प्रति परेण्य न्यूनतम (बीम स्पा.) 20 रु के अधीन रहने हुए पोत पर्यन्त नियान्ति कीम के 0.2% की दर से।

(ख) परेण्यानुमार नियान्ति के अधीन नियान्ति के लिए प्रति परेण्य न्यूनतम (बीम स्पा.) 20 रु के अधीन रहने हुए, पोत पर्यन्त नियान्ति कीम के 0.4% की दर से।

(2) उन विनिर्माता नियान्तिकर्ताओं के लिए जो गाड़ीयों/संच गाड़ीय क्षेत्रों की संबंधित सरकारों के पास लालू उद्योग एकांकों के स्वरूप में रजिस्ट्रीड्यूक्शन है, प्रति परेण्य न्यूनतम (बीम स्पा.) 20 रु के अधीन रहने हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18 प्रतिशत तथा 0.36 प्रतिशत की दर में होगी।"

[सं० 6(9)/80-नि० नथा नि० उ०]

\*टिप्पणी :—कांग्रेस 62, तारीख 1-1-1977।

**S.O. 29.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Pipe Fittings (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules<sup>\*</sup> 1977, namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Pipe Fittings (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Export of Pipe Fittings (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1977, for rule 6, in following rule shall be substituted namely :

#### "Inspection fee"

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

(i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.

(b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.

(iii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18 per cent and 0.36 per cent for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories."

[F. No. 6(9)/80-FI&EPI]

\*Footnote :—S.O. 62, dated 1-1-1977.

**कांग्रेस 30.**—केन्द्रीय सरकार, नियान्ति (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए, एकत्र चालित पम्प का नियान्ति (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम\*, 1967 का मंशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात् :—

1. (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम एकत्र चालित पम्प का नियान्ति (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) मंशोधन नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. एकत्र चालित पम्प का नियान्ति (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम\* 1967, के नियम 7, के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, अर्थात् :—

"(7) नियान्ति कीम :—नियान्तिकर्ता द्वारा अभिकरण को नियान्ति कीम निम्नलिखित के अनुसार की जाएगी :

(1)(क) उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन नियान्ति के लिए प्रति परेण्य न्यूनतम (बीम स्पा.) 20 रु के अधीन रहने हुए पोत पर्यन्त नियान्ति कीम के 0.2 प्रतिशत की दर से।

(ख) परेण्यानुमार नियान्ति के अधीन नियान्ति के लिए प्रति परेण्य न्यूनतम (बीम स्पा.) 20 रु के अधीन रहने हुए, पोत पर्यन्त नियान्ति कीम के 0.4 प्रतिशत की दर से।

(2) उन विनिर्माता नियान्तिकर्ताओं के लिए जो गाड़ीयों/संच गाड़ीय क्षेत्रों की संबंधित सरकारों के पास लालू उद्योग एकांकों के स्वरूप में रजिस्ट्रीड्यूक्शन है, प्रति परेण्य न्यूनतम (बीम स्पा.) 20 रु के अधीन रहने हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18 प्रतिशत तथा 0.36 प्रतिशत की दर में होगी।

[सं० 6(9)/80-नि० नथा नि० उ०]

\*टिप्पणी :—कांग्रेस 3221, तारीख 8-9-1967।

**S.O. 30.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Power Driven Pumps (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules<sup>1</sup> 1967 namely:—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Power Driven Pumps (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Export of Power Driver Pumps (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1967, for rule 7, in following rule shall be substituted namely:

#### 7. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under:

(i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.

(b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.

(ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18 per cent and 0.36 per cent for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories."

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

\*Footnote:—S.O. 3221, dated 8-9-1967.

**का० आ० 31.**—केन्द्रीय सरकार, नियंति (क्षालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) प्रधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, शक्ति परिणामिक का नियंति (क्षालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1977 का संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात्:—

1. (1) इन नियमों का महिला नाम शक्ति परिणामिक का नियंति (क्षालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये राजवट में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. शक्ति परिणामिक का नियंति (क्षालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1977 के नियम 7 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, अर्थात्:—

#### "(7) निरीक्षण फीस

नियंत्रिकर्ता द्वारा अभिकरण के निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी:—

(1) (क) उत्पादन के द्वारा क्षालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन नियंति के लिए प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीम रपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यंत निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2 प्रतिशत की दर से।

(ख) परेषणात्मक निरीक्षण के अधीन नियंति के लिए प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीम रपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यंत निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4 प्रतिशत की दर से।

(2) उन विनियमों नियंत्रिकर्ताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों के संबंधित सरकारों के पास लवू उद्योग एकांकों के रूप में रजिस्ट्रेशन हैं, प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीम रपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18 प्रतिशत तथा 0.36 प्रतिशत की दर से होगी।

[मं० 6(9)/80-नि० तथा नि० ३०]

टिप्पणी—का० आ० 2276, तारीख 9-7-1977

**S.O. 31.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Power Transformer (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules<sup>1</sup> 1977 namely:—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Power Transformer (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Export of Power Transformer (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1977, for rule 7, in following rule shall be substituted namely:

#### 7. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under:

(i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.

(b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.

(ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18 per cent and 0.36 for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of State/Union Territories".

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

\*Footnote:—S.O. 2276, dated 9-7-1977.

**का० आ० 32.**—केन्द्रीय सरकार, नियंति (क्षालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) प्रधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, क्षक्ति वाहनक वा नियंति (क्षालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1974 संशोधन का करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात्:—

1. (1) इन नियमों का महिला नाम कक्ष वासनकूलक का नियंति (क्षालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये राजवट में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे:

2. कक्ष वासनकूलक का नियंति (क्षालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1974 के नियम 6 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, अर्थात्:—

#### "(6) निरीक्षण फीस

नियंत्रिकर्ता द्वारा अभिकरण के निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी:—

(1) (क) उत्पादन के द्वारा क्षालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन नियंति के लिए प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीम रपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यंत निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2 प्रतिशत की दर से।

(ख) परेषणात्मक निरीक्षण के अधीन नियंति के लिए प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीम रपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यंत निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4 प्रतिशत की दर से।

(2) उन विनियमों नियंत्रिकर्ताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों के संबंधित सरकारों के पास लवू उद्योग एकांकों के रूप में रजिस्ट्रेशन हैं, प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीम रपए) 20 रु० के अधीन रहते हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18 प्रतिशत तथा 0.36 प्रतिशत की दर से होंगी।

[मं० 6(9)/80-नि० तथा नि० ३०]

टिप्पणी—का० आ० 2355, तारीख 14-9-1974

**S.O. 32.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Room Air Conditioners (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules\* 1974 namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Room Air Conditioners (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Export of Room Air Conditioners (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1974, for rule 6, in following rule shall be substituted namely :

#### "6. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

- (i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18 per cent and 0.36 per cent for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of State/Union Territories".

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

\*Footnote :—S.O. 2355, dated 14-9-1974.

**का० आ० 33.**—केंद्रीय सरकार, नियंत्रित (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, सफाई तथा जल फिटिंग्स का नियंत्रित (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1978 का संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अधिकृत :—

1. (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम सफाई तथा जल फिटिंग्स का नियंत्रित (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. सफाई तथा जल फिटिंग्स का नियंत्रित (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1978 के नियम 6 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, अधिकृत :—

#### "6. निरीक्षण फीस

नियंत्रित कर्ता द्वारा अधिकारण को निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के भनुभार दी जाएगी :

- (1) (क) उत्पादन के द्वारान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन नियंत्रित के लिए प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2% की दर से।
- (ज) परेषणानुसार निरीक्षण के अधीन नियंत्रित के लिए प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4% की दर से।
- (2) उन विनिर्माता नियंत्रितकर्ताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों की संबंधित सरकारों के पास लघु उद्योग एककों के रूप में रजिस्ट्रीड हैं, प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु के अधीन रहते हुए, (क). और (ख) के लिए 0.18% तथा 0.36% की दर से होगी।

[सं० 6(9)/80-नि० तथा नि० उ०]

**S.O. 33.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Sanitary Water Fittings (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules\* 1978, namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Sanitary Water Fittings (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Export of Sanitary Water Fittings (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1978, for rule 6, in following rule shall be substituted namely :

#### "6. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

- (i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per cent per consignment.
- (b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18 per cent and 0.36 per cent for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories".

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

\*Footnote :—S.O. 1509, dated 27-5-1978.

**का० आ० 34.**—केंद्रीय सरकार, नियंत्रित (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, मिनाई मरीन का नियंत्रित (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1967 का संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अधिकृत :—

1. (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम विलाई मरीन का नियंत्रित (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. मिनाई मरीन का नियंत्रित (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1967 के नियम 7 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, अधिकृत :—

#### "7. निरीक्षण फीस

नियंत्रित कर्ता द्वारा अधिकारण को नियंत्रण फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुभार दी जाएगी :

- (1) (क) उत्पादन के द्वारान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन नियंत्रित के लिए प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2% की दर से।
- (ख) परेषणानुसार नियंत्रण के अधीन नियंत्रित के लिए प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4% की दर से।
- (2) उन विनिर्माता नियंत्रितकर्ताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों की संबंधित सरकारों के पास लघु उद्योग एककों के रूप में रजिस्ट्रीड हैं, प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु के अधीन रहते हुए, (क). और (ख) के लिए 0.18% तथा 0.36% की दर से होगी।

[सं० 6(9)/80-नि० तथा नि० उ०]

टिप्पणी—का०आ० 1509, तारीख 27-5-1978

**S.O. 34.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Sewing Machines (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules\* 1967 namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Sewing Machines (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Export of Sewing Machines (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1967, for rule 7, in following rule shall be substituted namely :

#### “7. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

(i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.

(b) For exports consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.

(ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18 per cent and 0.36 per cent for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories”.

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

\*Footnote :—S.O. 3211, dated 7-9-1967.

**का० आ० 35.**—केन्द्रीय सरकार, नियंत्रित (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) प्रधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 हारा प्रश्नत एक्सेमों का प्रोग करने हुए, चारी के पत्तर घड़े घर्तनों का नियंत्रित (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1978 का संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात् :—

1. (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम चारी के पत्तर घड़े घर्तनों का नियंत्रित (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संवैधान नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. चारी के पत्तर घड़े घर्तनों का नियंत्रित (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1978 के नियम 7 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, अर्थात् :—

#### “7. निरीक्षण फीस

नियंत्रिकर्ता द्वारा अभिकारण को निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी :

(1) (क) उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्फीम के अधीन नियंत्रित के लिए प्रति परेवण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2% की दर से।

(ख) परेवणानुसार निरीक्षण के अधीन नियंत्रित के लिए प्रति परेवण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत दौलत निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4% की दर से।

(2) उन विनिर्माण नियंत्रिकर्ताओं के लिए जो गाड़ीयों/संघ राज्य शेहों की संबंधित सरकारों के पास लबू उद्योग एक्स्ट्रों के रूप में रजिस्ट्रीड़ हैं, प्रति परेवण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु के अधीन रहते हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18% तथा 0.36% की दर से होंगी।”

[सं० 6(9)/80-मि० नि० तथा नि० उ०]

टिप्पणी—का० आ० 719, तारीख 11-3-1978

**S.O. 35.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Silver Plated Wares (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules\* 1978 namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Silver Plated Wares (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Export of Silver Plated Wares (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1978, for rule 7, in following rule shall be substituted, namely

#### “6. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

(i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.

(b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.

(ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18 per cent and 0.36 per cent for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as small scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories”.

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

\*Footnote :—S.O. 719, dated 11-3-1978.

**का० आ० 36.**—केन्द्रीय सरकार, नियंत्रित (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) प्रधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 23) की धारा 17 हारा प्रश्नत एक्सेमों का प्रोग करते हुए, छोटे भौजार और हाथ के भौजार का नियंत्रित (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1967 का संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात् :—

1. (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम छोटे भौजार और हाथ के भौजार का नियंत्रित (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संवैधान नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. छोटे भौजार और हाथ के भौजार का नियंत्रित (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1967 के नियम 7 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, अर्थात् :—

#### “7. निरीक्षण फीस

नियंत्रिकर्ता द्वारा अभिकारण को निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी :

(1) (क) उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्फीम के अधीन नियंत्रित के लिए प्रति परेवण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2% की दर से।

(ख) परेवणानुसार निरीक्षण के अधीन नियंत्रित के लिए प्रति परेवण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4% की दर से।

(2) उन विनिर्माण नियंत्रिकर्ताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्य शेहों की संबंधित सरकारों के पास लबू उद्योग एक्स्ट्रों के रूप में रजिस्ट्रीड़ हैं, प्रति परेवण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु के अधीन रहते हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18% तथा 0.36% की दर से होंगी।”

[सं० 6(9)/80-नि० तथा नि० उ०]

टिप्पणी—का० आ० 3412, तारीख 20-9-1967

**S.O. 36.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Small Tools and Hand Tools (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules\* 1967, namely :

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Small Tools and Hand Tools (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Export of Small Tools and Hand Tools (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1967, for rule 7, in following rule shall be substituted namely :—

#### "7. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

(i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.

(b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.

(ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18 per cent and 0.36 per cent for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories".

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

\*Footnote :—S.O. 3412, dated 20-9-1967.

**का० मा० ३७.**—केन्द्रीय सरकार, निर्यात (क्वालिटी) नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, स्टेनलैस स्टील के बर्तन का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1967 का संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, प्रथमतः :—

1. (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम स्टेनलैस स्टील के बर्तन का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. स्टेनलैस स्टील के बर्तन का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1967 के नियम 7 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, प्रथमतः :—

#### "7. निरीक्षण फीस

निर्यातकर्ता द्वारा प्रयोगरण को निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के प्रमुखार दो जाएगी :

(1) (क) उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के प्रधीन नियात के लिए प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु. के प्रधीन रहते हुए पोत पाँच पाँच निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2% की दर से।

(ख) परेषणानुसार निरीक्षण के प्रधीन नियात के लिए प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु. के प्रधीन रहते हुए पोत पाँच निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4% की दर से।

(2) उन विनिर्माता नियंत्रिकार्तियों के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों की संबंधित सरकारों के पास लघु उद्योग एकांकों के रूप में रजिस्ट्रीकूट हैं, प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु. के प्रधीन रहते हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18% सथा 0.36% की दर से होंगी।

[सं० ६(९)/८०-निं०नि० तथा नि० ३०]

टिप्पणी—का० मा० ३७२, तारीख २७-१-१९८१

**S.O. 37.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Stainless Steel Utensils (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules\* 1967 namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Stainless Steel Utensils (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Export of Stainless Steel Utensils (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1967, for rule 7, in following rule shall be substituted namely :

#### "7. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

(i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.

(b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.

(ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18 per cent and 0.36 per cent for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories".

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

\*Footnote :—S.O. 372, dated 27-1-1968.

**का० मा० ३८.**—केन्द्रीय सरकार, निर्यात क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, स्टील ट्यूब का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1970 का संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, प्रथमतः :—

1. (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम स्टील ट्यूब का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. स्टील ट्यूब का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1970 के नियम 6 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, प्रथमतः :—

#### "6. निरीक्षण फीस

निर्यातकर्ता द्वारा प्रयोगरण को निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के प्रमुखार दो जाएगी :

(i) (क) उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के प्रधीन नियात के लिए प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु. के प्रधीन रहते हुए पोत पाँच निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2% की दर से।

(ख) परेषणानुसार निरीक्षण के प्रधीन नियात के लिए प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु. के प्रधीन रहते हुए पोत पाँच निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4% की दर से।

(ii) उन विनिर्माता नियंत्रिकार्तियों के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों की संबंधित नरकारों के पास लघु उद्योग एकांकों के रूप में रजिस्ट्रीकूट हैं, प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु. के प्रधीन रहते हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18% सथा 0.36% की दर से होंगी।

[सं० ६(९)/८०-निं० तथा नि० ३०]

टिप्पणी—का० मा० 2743 तारीख 13-8-1970

**S.O. 38.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Steel Tubes (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules<sup>\*</sup> 1970 namely:—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Steel Tubes (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Export of Steel Tubes (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1970, for rule 6, in following rule shall be substituted namely:

#### “6. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

(i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.

(b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.

(ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18 per cent and 0.36 per cent for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories".

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

\*Footnote :—S.O. 2743, dated 13-8-1970.

**का० आ० 39.**—केन्द्रीय सरकार, निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और (निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, स्टील के ट्रंक का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1967 का संशोधन करते के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात् :—

1. (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम स्टील के ट्रंक का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. स्टील के ट्रंक का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1967 के नियम 6 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, अर्थात्

#### “6. निरीक्षण फीस

निर्यातकर्ता द्वारा अभिकरण को निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी :

(i) (क) उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु. के अधीन रहते हुए पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2% की दर से।

(ख) परेषणानुसार निरीक्षण के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु. के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4% की दर से।

(ii) उन विनिर्माताओं नियातकर्ताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों की संबंधित सरकारों के पास लघु उत्पाद एकांकों के रूप में रजिस्ट्रीकूट हैं, प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु. के अधीन रहते हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18% तथा 0.36% की दर से होगी।

[सं० 6 (9)/80-नि० नि० तथा नि० उ०]

टिप्पणी—का० आ० 4455 तारीख 14-12-1967

**S.O. 39.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Steel Trunks (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules<sup>\*</sup> 1967 namely:—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Steel Trunks (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Export of Steel Trunks (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1967, for rule 6, in following rule shall be substituted namely:

#### “6. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

(i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.

(b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.

(ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18 per cent and 0.36 per cent for (a) and (b), respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories".

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

\*Footnote :—S.O. 4455, dated 14-12-1967.

**का० आ० 40.**—केन्द्रीय सरकार, निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, इस्पात के तार के रस्से का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1980 का संशोधन करते के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात् :—

1. (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम इस्पात के तार के रस्से का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. इस्पात के तार के रस्से का निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1974 के नियम 7 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, अर्थात् :—

#### “7. निरीक्षण फीस

निर्यातकर्ता द्वारा अभिकरण को निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी :

(i) (क) उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु. के अधीन रहते हुए पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2% की दर से।

(ख) परेषणानुसार निरीक्षण के अधीन निर्यात के लिए प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु. के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4% की दर से।

(ii) उन विनिर्माताओं नियातकर्ताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों की संबंधित सरकारों के पास लघु उत्पाद एकांकों के रूप में रजिस्ट्रीकूट हैं, प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु. के अधीन रहते हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18% तथा 0.36% की दर से होगी।

[सं० 6 (9)/80-नि० नि० तथा नि० उ०]

टिप्पणी—का० आ० 1990 तारीख 10-8-1974

**S.O. 40.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Steel Wire Ropes (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules\* 1974 namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Steel Wire Rope (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Export of Steel Wire Ropes (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1974, for rule 7, in following rule shall be substituted namely :

#### “7. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

- (i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18 per cent and 0.36 per cent for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories".

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

\*Footnote :—S.O. 1990, dated 10-8-1974.

**का० आ० 41.**—केन्द्रीय सरकार, नियर्ति (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) प्रधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, संचायक बैटरी का नियर्ति (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1978 का संशोधन करते के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, प्रथात् :—

6. (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम संचायक बैटरी का नियर्ति (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. संचायक बैटरी का नियर्ति (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1978 के नियम 7 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, प्रथात् :—

#### 7. निरीक्षण फीस

नियर्तिकर्ता द्वारा अभिकरण को निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी :

(i) (क) उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन नियर्ति के लिए प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु. के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2% की दर से।

(ख) परेषणानुसार निरीक्षण के अधीन नियर्ति के लिए प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु. के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4% की दर से।

(2) उन विनिर्माता नियांतकताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्य भेत्रों की संबंधित सरकारों के पास लघु उद्योग एकांकों के रूप में रजिस्ट्रीड हैं, प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु. के अधीन रहते हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18% तथा 0.36% की दर से होंगी।

[सं० 6(9)/80-नि० निं० तथा नि० उ०]

टिप्पणी—का० आ० 1507 तारीख 27-5-1978

**S.O. 41.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Storage Batteries (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules\* 1978 namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Storage Batteries (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Export of Storage Batteries (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1978, for rule 7, in following rule shall be substituted namely :

#### “7. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

- (i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.
- (ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18 per cent and 0.36 per cent for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories".

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

\*Footnote :—S.O. 1507, dated 27-5-1978.

**का० आ० 42.**—केन्द्रीय सरकार, नियर्ति (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) प्रधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, पारेषण लाइन टावर का नियर्ति (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1971 का संशोधन करते के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, प्रथात् :—

1. (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम पारेषण लाइन टावर का नियर्ति (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. पारेषण लाइन टावर का नियर्ति (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1971 के नियम 7 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, प्रथात् :—

#### “7. निरीक्षण फीस

नियर्तिकर्ता द्वारा अभिकरण को निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी :

(1) (क) उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन नियर्ति के लिए प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु. के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.2% की दर से।

(ख) परेषणानुसार निरीक्षण के अधीन नियर्ति के लिए प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु. के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के 0.4% की दर से।

(ii) उन विनिर्माता नियांतकताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्य भेत्रों की संबंधित सरकारों के पास लघु उद्योग एकांकों के रूप में रजिस्ट्रीड हैं, प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु. के अधीन रहते हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18% तथा 0.36% की दर से होंगी।

[सं० 6(9)/80-नि० निं० तथा नि० उ०]

टिप्पणी—का० आ० 5577 तारीख 25-12-1971

**S.O. 42.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Transmission Line Towers (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules\* 1971 namely:—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Transmission Line Towers (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Export of Transmission Line Towers (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1971, for rule 7, the following rule shall be substituted namely :

#### 7. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

(i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.

(b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.

(ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18 per cent and 0.36 per cent for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories".

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

\*Footnote :—S.O. 5577, dated 25-12-1971.

**का०प्रा० 43.**—केन्द्रीय सरकार, नियांति (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त भवितव्यों का प्रयोग करते हुए, बाल्डों का नियांति (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम\*, 1978 का संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, प्रथात् :—

1. (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम बाल्डों का नियांति (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. बाल्डों का नियांति (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1978 के नियम 9 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, प्रथात् :—

"9. निरीक्षण फीस : नियांतकर्ता द्वारा अभिकरण को निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी

(1) (क) उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन नियांति के लिए प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु. के अधीन रहने हुए पोत पर्याति निःशुल्क भूल्य के 0.2 प्रतिशत की दर से।

(ख) परेषणानुसार निरीक्षण के अधीन नियांति के लिए प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु. के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्याति निःशुल्क भूल्य के 0.4 प्रतिशत की दर से।

(2) उन विनिर्भाति नियांतकर्ताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्य शेर्कों की संबंधित सरकारों के पास लघु उद्योग एकांकों के रूप में रजिस्ट्री-हृत है, प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु. के अधीन रहते हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18 प्र० तथा 0.36 प्र० की दर से होगी।

[सं० 6(9)/80-निं०नि० तथा नि०उ०]

\*टिप्पणी :—का०प्रा० 3094 तारीख 29-10-1978

**S.O. 43.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Valves (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules\* 1978 namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Valves (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Export of Valves (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1978, for rule 9, the following rule shall be substituted namely .

#### 9. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

(i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.

(b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.

(ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18 per cent and 0.36 per cent for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories".

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

\*Footnote :—S.O. 3094, dated 29-10-1978.

**का०प्रा० 44**—केन्द्रीय सरकार नियांति (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त भवितव्यों का प्रयोग करते हुए, बाल्डों का नियांति (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम\*, 1974 का संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, प्रथात् :—

1. (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम बाल्डों का नियांति (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2 बाल्डों का नियांति (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1974 के नियम 6 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, प्रथात् :—

"6. निरीक्षण फीस : नियांतकर्ता द्वारा अभिकरण को निरीक्षण फीस निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी।

(1) (क) उत्पादन के दौरान क्वालिटी नियंत्रण स्कीम के अधीन नियांति के लिए प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु. के अधीन रहते हुए पोत पर्याति निःशुल्क भूल्य के 0.2 प्र० की दर से।

(ख) परेषणानुसार निरीक्षण के अधीन नियांति के लिए प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु. के अधीन रहते हुए, बाल्डों के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्याति निःशुल्क भूल्य के 0.4 प्र० की दर से।

(2) उन विनिर्भाति नियांतकर्ताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्य शेर्कों की संबंधित सरकारों के पास लघु उद्योग एकांकों के रूप में रजिस्ट्री-हृत है, प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु. के अधीन रहते हुए, (क) और (ख) के लिए 0.18 प्र० तथा 0.36 प्र० की दर से होगी।

[सं० 6(9)/80-निं०नि० तथा नि०उ०]

\*टिप्पणी :—का०प्रा० 2353 तारीख 14-9-74

**S.O. 44.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Water Coolers (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules\* 1974 namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Water Coolers (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

**2 In the Export of Water Coolers (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1974, for rule 6, the following rule shall be substituted namely**

#### "6. Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

- (i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs 20 per consignment
- (b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs 20 per consignment
- (ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18 per cent and 0.36 per cent for (i) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories"

[F No 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

\*Footnote —S O 2353 dated 14-9-1974

का०आ० 45 —केन्द्रीय सरकार, नियंति (क्वालिटी नियन्त्रण और निरीक्षण) प्रधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त संकेतों का प्रयोग करते हुए, बैलिंग इंजीनियरों का नियंति (क्वालिटी नियन्त्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम\* 1978 का संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अधीत् —

1 (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम बैलिंग इंजीनियरों का नियंति (क्वालिटी नियन्त्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2 बैलिंग इंजीनियरों का नियंति (क्वालिटी नियन्त्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1978 के नियम 7 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, अधीत् —

"7 नियंत्रण फीस —नियंत्रित द्वारा प्रसिकरण को निरीक्षण कीम निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी

(1) (क) उत्पादन के द्वारा क्वालिटी नियन्त्रण स्कीम के अधीन नियंति के लिए प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु. के अधीन रहते हुए पोत पर्यंत नियूनक मूल्य के 0.2 प्र० की दर से।

(ख) परेषणानुसार निरीक्षण के अधीन नियंति के लिए प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु. के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यंत नियूनक मूल्य के 0.4 प्रतिशत की दर से।

(2) उन विनिर्माता नियंत्रिताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों की संबंधित सरकारों के पास लघु उद्योग एककों के रूप में रजिस्ट्री हृत हैं, प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु. के अधीन रहते हुए, (क) भौर (ख) के लिए 0.18 प्र० तथा 0.36 प्र० की दर से होगी।

[सं० 6(9)/80-नियंति० संथा निय०३०]

\*टिप्पणी —का०आ० 1611 तारीख 3-6-1978।

**S O. 45.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Welding Electrodes (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules\* 1978 namely —**

1. (1) These rules may be called the Export of Welding Electrodes (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette

2. In the Export of Welding Electrodes (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1978, for rule 7, the following rule shall be substituted namely :

#### "7 Inspection fee

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under

- (i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment
- (b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs 20 per consignment
- (ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18 per cent and 0.36 per cent for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories".

[F No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

\*Footnote.—S O 1611 dated 3-6-1978.

का०आ० 46—केन्द्रीय सरकार नियंति (क्वालिटी नियन्त्रण और निरीक्षण) प्रधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त संकेतों का प्रयोग करते हुए, इस्पात के तार की लड़ियों का नियंति (क्वालिटी नियन्त्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम\*, 1979 का संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अधीत् —

1 (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम इस्पात के तार की लड़ियों का नियंति (क्वालिटी नियन्त्रण और निरीक्षण) संशोधन नियम, 1980 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2 इस्पात के तार लड़ियों का नियंति (क्वालिटी नियन्त्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1979 के नियम 7 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित नियम रखा जाएगा, अधीत् —

"7 निरीक्षण फीस —नियंत्रित द्वारा प्रसिकरण को निरीक्षण कीम निम्नलिखित के अनुसार दी जाएगी

(1) (क) उत्पादन के द्वारा क्वालिटी नियन्त्रण स्कीम के अधीन नियंति के लिए प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु. के अधीन रहते हुए पोत पर्यंत नियूनक मूल्य के 0.2 प्र० की दर से।

(ख) परेषणानुसार निरीक्षण के अधीन नियंति के लिए प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु. के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यंत नियूनक मूल्य के 0.4 प्र० की दर से।

(2) उन विनिर्माता नियंत्रिताओं के लिए जो राज्यों/संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों की संबंधित सरकारों के पास लघु उद्योग एककों के रूप में रजिस्ट्री हृत हैं, प्रति परेषण न्यूनतम (बीस रुपए) 20 रु. के अधीन रहते हुए, (क) भौर (ख) के लिए 0.18 प्र० तथा 0.36 प्र० की दर से होगी।

[सं० 6(9)/80-नियंति० तथा निय०३०]

\*टिप्पणी —का०आ० 2125 तारीख 23-6-1978।

**S O. 46.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules to amend the Export of Steel Wire Strands (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules\* 1979 namely :—**

1 (1) These rules may be called the Export of Steel Wire Strands (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Export of Steel Wire Strands (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1978, for rule 7, the following rule shall be substituted namely :

**"7. Inspection fee**

Inspection fee shall be paid by the exporter to the Agency as under :

(i) (a) For exports under in-process quality control scheme at the rate of 0.2 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.

(b) For exports under consignmentwise inspection at the rate of 0.4 per cent of the F.O.B. value subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment.

(ii) Subject to the minimum of Rs. 20 per consignment, the rate shall be 0.18 per cent and 0.36 per cent for (a) and (b) respectively for manufacturer-exporters who are registered as Small Scale Manufacturing units with the concerned Governments of States/Union Territories".

[F. No. 6(9)/80-EI&EP]

\*Footnote :—S.O. 2125, dated 23-6-1979.

**आवेदन**

नई दिल्ली, 3 अक्टूबर, 1981

का० आ० ५७.—नियति (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 6 द्वारा प्रदत्त गतियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार की यह राय है कि भारत के नियंत्रित व्यापार के विकास के लिए ऐसा करना आवश्यक और समीक्षन है कि सीमेंट कंकरीट की फर्श की टाइलों का नियंत्रित से पूर्व निरीक्षण किया जाए ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त प्रयोजन के लिए भीचे विनियिष्ट प्रस्ताव बनाए हैं और उन्हें नियंत्रित (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1964 के नियम 11 के उप-नियम (2) की भ्रष्टानुसार नियंत्रित निरीक्षण परिषद् को भेज दिया है ;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त उपनियम के अनुसार में उक्त प्रस्तावों की उन लोगों की जानकारी के लिए प्रकाशित करती है, जिनके उनसे प्रभावित होने की संभावना है।

2. सूचना दी जाती है कि यदि कोई व्यक्ति उक्त प्रस्तावों के बारे में कोई आवेदन या सुझाव भेजता चाहता है तो वह उसे (इस आवेदन के राजपत्र) में प्रकाशित होने की सारीख से पैतालीस दिन के भीतर नियंत्रित निरीक्षण परिषद्, 'बल्ड ट्रेड सेन्टर' 14/1-जी, एचरा स्ट्रीट (आठवीं भंडिल) कलकत्ता-700001 को भेज सकता है।

**प्रस्ताव**

(i) यह अधिसूचित करना कि सीमेंट कंकरीट की फर्श की टाइलों का नियंत्रित से पूर्व निरीक्षण किया जाएगा :

(ii) (क) सुर्योग भारतीय या अन्य राष्ट्रीय मानकों को, या

(ख) नियंत्रित-कर्ता द्वारा विवेशी जेता और नियंत्रित-कर्ता के मध्य नियंत्रित संविदा के स्वीकृत विनियोगों के रूप में घोषित विनियोगों का परन्तु यह तब जब कि वे उपरोक्त (क) में विए गए मानकों से नीचे के न होंगे,

सीमेंट कंकरीट की फर्श की टाइलों के लिए मानक विनियोगों के रूप में मापदण्ड देना ।

(iii) इस भारत के उप-वर्ष-1 में उप-वर्णित, सीमेंट कंकरीट की फर्श की टाइलों का नियंत्रित (निरीक्षण) नियम, 1980 के प्राप्ति के अनुसार निरीक्षण के प्रकार को निरीक्षण के ऐसे प्रकार के रूप में विनियिष्ट करना जो ऐसा सीमेंट कंकरीट के फर्श की टाइलों को लागू होगा,

(iv) अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय व्यापार के बौगत ऐसी सीमेंट कंकरीट की फर्श की टाइलों के नियंत्रित को तब तक प्रतिषिद्ध करना जब तक कि उसके साथ नियंत्रित (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 7 के अधीन स्थापित नियंत्रित निरीक्षण अभिकरणों में से किसी एक अभिकरण द्वारा जारी किया गया इस भारत का प्रमाण पत्र न हो कि सीमेंट कंकरीट की फर्श की टाइलें पूर्वोक्त मानक विनियोगों के अनुरूप हैं ।

3 इस भारत की कोई भी यात्रा भारी जेताओं को भूमि, समुद्र या आयु सामग्री द्वारा सीमेंट कंकरीट की टाइलों के वास्तविक नमूनों के नियंत्रित को लागू नहीं होगी परन्तु यह तब जब कि परेषण का पोत पर्याप्त मूल्य दो सी पाचास रुपए से अधिक हो ।

4 इस भारत में "सीमेंट कंकरीट के फर्श की टाइलों" से वे टाइलें अधिकृत हैं जो साधारण पोर्टलैड या क्वालिटी पोर्टलैड सीमेंट प्राकृतिक योग तथा रीवीन सामग्री के मिश्रण से विनियिष्ट वाव प्रक्रिया द्वारा, जहाँ अपेक्षित हो, विनियिष्ट हैं तथा इसके अन्तर्गत साधारण सीमेंट, साधारण रंग तथा टैराजों प्रकार की टाइले भी हैं । टाइलों के प्रकार के लिए निम्नलिखित परिमाण लागू होंगी :—

(क) साधारण सीमेंट की टाइलें—वे टाइलें हैं जिनके विनियमित में वर्षकों का प्रयोग नहीं किया जाता ।

(ख) साधारण रंग की टाइलें—वे टाइलें हैं जिनकी सपाट विसर्जन वाली सतह होती है जिनमें वर्षक (क) का प्रयोग किया जाता है किन्तु वे स्टोव चिप्स रहित नहीं हैं ।

(ग) टेराजों टाइलें—वे टाइलें हैं जिनकी विसर्जन वाली सतह वर्षक महित या रहित प्रक्रिया पोर्टलैड सीमेंट के मैटिक्स में स्टोव चिप्स से बनी हैं ।

**उपाध्य-1**

नियंत्रित (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 के अधीन बनाए जाने वाले प्रस्तावित नियमों का प्रारूप ।

1. संक्षिप्त माम :—इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त माम सीमेंट कंकरीट की फर्श की टाइलों का नियंत्रित (निरीक्षण) नियम, 1980 है ।

2. परिमाणांग :—इन नियमों में जब तक कि संबंध से मन्यथा अपेक्षित न हो,—

(क) "अधिनियम" से नियंत्रित (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) अधिकृत है,

(ख) "अभिकरण" से अधिनियम की धारा 7 के अधीन स्थापित नियंत्रित निरीक्षण अभिकरणों में से कोई एक अभिकरण अधिकृत है,

(ग) "परिषद्" से अधिनियम की धारा 3 के अधीन स्थापित नियंत्रित निरीक्षण परिषद् अधिकृत है,

(घ) "सीमेंट कंकरीट के फर्श की टाइलों" से वे टाइलें अधिकृत हैं जो साधारण पोर्टलैड या क्वालिटी पोर्टलैड सीमेंट प्राकृतिक योग तथा रीवीन सामग्री के मिश्रण से वाव प्रक्रिया द्वारा, जहाँ अपेक्षित हो, विनियिष्ट हैं तथा इनके अन्तर्गत साधारण सीमेंट, साधारण रंग तथा टेराजों प्रकार की टाइलें भी हैं । टाइलों के प्रकार के लिए निम्नलिखित परिमाणांग लागू होंगी :—

(i) साधारण सीमेंट की टाइलें हैं जो टाइलें जिनके विनियमित में वर्षकों का प्रयोग महीने होता ।

- (ii) साधारण रूपों टाइले—वे टाइले जिनकी मात्रा विशेष बाती सतह होती है, किन्तु वे स्टोन चिप्स रहित होते हैं। जिनमें वर्णकों का प्रयोग किया जाता है,
- (iii) देंगो टाइले—वे टाइले हैं जिनकी घिम्में बाली मशहूर वर्णक सहित या रहित मिश्रण पोटेंटियल भीमेट के मैट्रिक्स में स्टोन चिप्स में होती है।
- (iv) 'अनुसूची' में हन नियमों में समान अनुसूची श्रेणीत है,

3. नियोक्षण का आधार.—नियोत के लिए आशयित भीमेट कंकरीट की कर्ण की टाइलों का नियोक्षण यह सुनिश्चित करने से किया जाएगा कि उनकी भवालिटी अधिनियम की धारा 6 के अधीन केंद्रीय सरकार द्वारा मान्यताप्राप्त विनियोगों के अनुरूप है, अर्थात्—

- (क) सुमित्र भारतीय या अन्य कोई राष्ट्रीय मानकों, या
- (ख) नियोतकर्ता द्वारा विदेशी केन्द्रों और नियोतकर्ता के मध्य नियोत संविदा के स्वीकृत विनियोगों के रूप में घोषित विनियोग परन्तु यह तब जबकि वे उपरोक्त (क) में दिए गए मानकों से नीचे के न हों, या
- (ग) अनुसूची में विनियोग, परीक्षण पद्धति तथा नमूना नेने के भाव मानकों को अपना कर नैयार उत्पाद के नियोक्षण तथा परीक्षण के आधार पर।

4. नियोक्षण की प्रक्रिया :—(1) भीमेट कंकरीट की कर्ण बो टाइलों का नियोत करने का इच्छुक नियोत कर्ता अपने गेमा करने के आशय की मूलता लिखित रूप में सबवित नियोत नियोक्षण अभिकरण को देगा तथा ऐसी मूलता के गाथ नियोत संविदा या आदेश की एक प्रति अभिकरण के निकटम कार्यालय को दे ताकि वह नियम 3 के अनुसार नियोक्षण कर सके।

(2) उपनियम (1) के अधीन प्रत्येक मूलता लदान की आशयित नारीब से कम से कम दिन पहले भी जाएगी।

(3) उपनियम (2) के अधीन मूलता प्राप्त होने पर अभिकरण नियम 3 तथा परियद् द्वारा ममय-ममय पर जारी किए गए नियमों के अनुसार नियोक्षण करेगा।

(4) यदि नियोक्षण के पश्चात् अभिकरण का मर ममाधान हो जाता है कि सोमेट कंकरीट की कर्ण की टाइलों का नियोत किए जाने वाला परेपण नियम 3 की अपेक्षाओं के अनुरूप है तो वह उपनियम (2) के अधीन मूलता प्राप्त होने के सात दिनों के भीतर यह घोषणा करते हुए कि परेपण नियोत योग्य है, नियोत कर्ता को प्रमाण-पत्र जारी करेगा :

परन्तु जहाँ अभिकरण का इस प्रकार ममाधान नहीं होता है वह उस दिन की उक्त अवधि के भीतर ऐसा, प्रमाण पत्र जारी करने से इकार कर देगा तथा ऐसे इकार की मूलता उसके कारणों सहित नियोत कर्ता को देगा।

5. नियोक्षण का स्थान.—इन नियमों के अधीन प्रत्येक नियोक्षण या तो विनियोग के परिमार पर किया जाएगा या उस परिमार पर किया जाएगा जहाँ नियोत कर्ता द्वारा मान देने किया जाता है परन्तु यह सब जब कि वहाँ इस प्रयोगत के लिए पर्याप्त भुविताएँ यिद्धमान हों।

6. नियोक्षण फीम.—प्रत्येक परेपण के लिए न्यूनतम 100 रुपये के अधीन रहने हुए, ऐसे प्रत्येक परेपण के लिए प्रति पर्याप्ति तिणुलक मूल्य के प्रत्येक एक सौ रुपये के लिए 50 पैसे की दर से नियोक्षण फीम के स्वरूप में दी जाएगी।

7. अपील.—(i) नियम 4 के उप-नियम (4) के अधीन नियोक्षण अभिकरण द्वारा प्रभाव-पत्र जारी करने में इकार किए जाने से व्यवित कोई अवक्षिप्त होने के दिन दिनों के भीतर इस प्रयोगत के लिए केंद्रीय सरकार द्वारा नियुक्त भीन अन्यून किन्तु अधिकरतम

भारत में अनधिक व्यक्तियों में गठित विजेपकों के पैनल को अपील कर सकता है।

- (ii) विशेषज्ञों के पैनल की कूल मदम्भता के कम में कम दो निहाई मदम्भ और सरकारी मदम्भ होंगे।
- (iii) पैनल की गणपूर्ति तीन से होंगी।
- (iv) अपील प्राप्त होने के पश्चात् दिन के भीतर निपटा दी जाएगी।

### अनुसूची

1. नमूना लेने का मापमान:—नमूना लेने के मापमान के संबंध में मंत्रिमंडल के विनियोगों में विनियोगित अनुबंधों के अभाव में नीचे अधिकारित अनुबंध लागू होता है।

प्रपेक्षित परीक्षणों को करने के लिए प्रपेक्षित टाइलों का चयन यावृच्छिक प्रतिवर्त्यन मापमान द्वारा किया जाएगा। 110.000 टाइलों के या धारा के प्रत्येक परेपण में से चयन की जाने वाली टाइलों की सख्ती निम्नलिखित होती है।

(क) आकार तथा विस्तार, विम्बने वाली पर्याप्त तथा साधारण भवाली पर अपेक्षाओं की अनुसृप्तता के लिए—12 टाइलें।

(ख) अनुप्रस्थ क्षमता परीक्षण के लिए :

(i) शुष्क परीक्षण के लिए ..... 6 टाइलें

(ii) आत्र परीक्षण के लिए : ..... 6 टाइलें

उक्त (क) के लिए चयन की गई टाइले, अपेक्षाओं के सत्यापन के पश्चात्

उक्त (ख) के लिए भी प्रयोग की जा सकती है।

(ग) शिराई परीक्षण की रोपना के लिए ..... 6 टाइलें

(घ) जल अवशोषण परीक्षण के लिए ..... 6 टाइलें

2. अनुरूपता के मापदण्ड—यदि नियोत संविदा में अन्यथा विनियोग नहीं किया जाता है तो किए गए परीक्षणों की अनुरूपता के मापदण्ड समय-समय पर संसोधित मुसम्मत भारतीय मानक विनियोग, अधीन भा० मा० 1237-1959 के अनुसार होंगे और उनका अनुसरण किया जाएगा।

3. परीक्षण की पद्धतियाँ—यदि नियोत संविदा में विनियोग नहीं है तो उस परीक्षण पद्धति का अनुसरण किया जाएगा जो समय-समय पर संसोधित मुसम्मत भारतीय मानक विनियोग, अधीन भा० मा० 1237-1959 में विनियोग है।

[न० 6(15)/80-नि०नि० नथा नि० उ०]

### ORDER

New Delhi, the 3rd January, 1981

S.O. 47.—Whereas, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 6 of the Export (Quality Control & Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government is of opinion that it is necessary or expedient so to do for the development of the export trade of India that cement concrete flooring tiles should be subject to inspection prior to export;

And whereas the Central Government has formulated the proposals specified below for the said purpose and has forwarded the same to the Export Inspection Council, as required by sub-rule (2) of rule 11 of the Export (Quality Control & Inspection) Rules, 1964.

Now, therefore, in pursuance of the said sub-rule the Central Government hereby publishes the said proposals for the information of the public likely to be affected thereby.

2. Notice is hereby given that any person desiring to forward any objections or suggestions with respect to the said proposals may forward the same within forty five days of the date of publication of this Order in the Official Gazette to the Export Inspection Council, 'World Trade Centre', 14/1B Ezra Street, (7th floor), Calcutta-700 001.

## PROPOSALS

- (i) To notify that cement concrete flooring tiles shall be subject to inspection prior to export;
  - (ii) To Recognise—
    - (a) Relevant Indian or any other National Standards; or
    - (b) the specifications declared by the exporter to be the agreed specifications of the export contract between the foreign buyer and the exporter, provided the same are not below the standard as in (a) above; as the standard specifications for cement concrete flooring tiles;
  - (iii) To specify the type of inspection in accordance with the draft Export of Cement Concrete Flooring Tiles (Inspection) Rules, 1980 set out in Annexure I to this Order, as the type of inspection which would be applied to such cement concrete flooring tiles;
  - (iv) To prohibit the export in the course of International Trade of such cement concrete floorin tiles, unless the same is accompanied by a certificate, issued by any of the Export Inspection Agencies, established under section 7 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963) to the effect, that the cement concrete flooring tiles conform to the aforesaid standard specifications.
3. Nothing in this Order shall apply to the export by land, sea or air of bonafide samples of cement concrete flooring tiles to the prospective buyers provided the F. O. B. value of the consignment does not excess rupees two hundred and fifty.
4. In this Order "cement concrete flooring tiles" shall mean tiles manufactured from a mixture of ordinary portland or rapid hardening portland cement, natural aggregates and colouring material where required, by pressure and covers tiles of plain cement, plain coloured and terrazo types. The following definitions shall apply for the types of tiles—
- (a) Plain Cement Tiles—Tiles in the manufacture of which no pigments are used.
  - (b) Plain coloured Tiles—Tiles having a plain wearing surface wherein pigments are used but without stone chips.
  - (c) Terrazo Tiles—Tiles whose wearing surface is composed of stone chip in matrix of portland cement mixed with or without pigments.

## ANNEXURE-I

[Draft rules proposed to be made under section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963)]

1. Short title :—These rules may be called the Export of Cement Concrete Flooring Tiles (Inspection) Rules, 1980.
2. Definitions :—In these rules unless the context otherwise requires—
  - (a) "Act" means the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963);
  - (b) "Agency" means any one of the Export Inspection Agencies established under section 7 of the Act;
  - (c) "Council" means Export Inspection Council established under section 3 of the Act;
  - (d) "Cement concrete flooring tiles" means tiles manufactured from a mixture of ordinary portland or rapid hardening portland cement, natural aggregates and colouring material where required, by pressure process and covers tiles of plain cement, plain coloured and terrazo types. The following definitions shall apply for the types of tiles :—
    - (i) Plain cement tiles—Tiles in the manufacture of which no pigments are used
    - (ii) Plain coloured tiles—Tiles having a plain surface wherein pigments are used, but without stone chips,

(iii) Terrazo tiles—Tiles whose wearing surface is composed of stone chips in matrix of portland cement mixed with or without pigments.

(e) "Schedule" means the Schedule appended to these rules;

3. Basis of inspection :—Inspection of cement concrete flooring tiles shall be carried out with a view to ensuring that the quality of the same conforms to the specifications recognised by the Central Government under section 6 of the Act, namely, (a) relevant Indian or any other National Standards ; or (b) the specifications declared by the exporter to export cement concrete flooring tiles shall give intimation the foreign buyer and the exporter, provided the same are not below the standard as in (a) above,

(c) On the basis of inspection and testing of finished products by adopting the scale of sampling and method of test specified in the Schedule.

4. Procedure of inspection :—(1) The exporter intending to export cement concrete flooring tiles shall give intimation in writing of his intention so to do, to the concerned Export Inspection Agency and submit along with such intimation a copy of the export contract or order to the nearest office of the Agency to enable it to carry out the inspection in accordance with rule 3.

(2) Every intimation under sub-rule (1) shall be given not less than seven days before the expected date of shipment.

(3) On receipt of the intimation under sub rule (2) the Agency shall carry out the inspection in accordance with rule 3 and instruction issued by the Council from time to time.

(4) If, after the inspection, the agency is satisfied that the consignment of cement concrete flooring tiles to be exported complies with the requirement of rule 3;

It shall within seven days of the receipt of the intimation under sub-rule (2) issue a certificate to the exporter declaring the consignment as export-worthy :

Provided that where the Agency is not so satisfied, it shall within the said period of seven days refuse to issue such certificate and communicate such refusal to the exporter along with the reasons therefor.

5. Place of inspection :—Every inspection under these rules shall be carried out either at the premises of the manufacturer or at the premises at which the goods are offered by the exporter, provided adequate facilities for the purpose exist therein.

6. Inspection Fee :—Subject to minimum of Rs. 100/- for each consignment, a fee at the rate of 50 paise for every one hundred rupees of the F. O. B. value for each such consignment shall be paid as inspection fee.

7. Appeal.—(i) Any person aggrieved by the refusal of the inspection agency to issue a certificate under sub-rule (4) of rule 4, may, within ten days of receipt of the communication of such refusal by him, prefer an appeal to a panel of experts consisting of not less three but not more than seven persons as may be appointed for the purpose by the Central Government.

(ii) At least two thirds of the total membership of the panel of experts shall consist of non-officials.

(iii) The quorum for the panel shall be three.

(iv) The appeal shall be disposed of within fifteen days of its receipt.

## SCHEDULE

1. Scale of sampling:—In absence of specific stipulation in the contractual specifications as regards sampling scale, the same as laid down below shall become applicable.

The tiles required for carrying out the required tests shall be selected by 'random sampling'. The number of tiles to be selected from each consignment of 10,000 tiles or part thereof shall be as follows :—

(a) For conformity to requirements on shape and dimensions, wearinglayer, and general quality—12 tiles.

(b) For transverse strength test :

- (i) For dry test ..... .... .... 6 tiles  
 (ii) For wet test ..... .... .... 6 tiles

The tiles selected for (a) may as well, after verification of requirements, be used for (b).

- (c) For resistance to wear test ..... .... 6 tiles  
 (d) For water absorption test ..... .... 6 tiles

**2. Criteria of conformity**—If not otherwise specified in the export contract, the criteria of conformity of the tests carried out shall be as per relevant Indian Standard specification, namely IS 1237-1959 as amended from time to time or shall be followed.

**3. Methods of test**—If not specified in the export contract, test methods as specified in the relevant Indian Standards specification, namely, IS 1237-1959 as amended from time to time shall be followed.

[No. 6 (15)/80-EI &amp; EPI]

**का० आ० 48.—** भारत के नियंत्रित व्यापार के विकास के लिए पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़े का नियंत्रित से पूर्व फ्यालिटी नियंत्रण और नियोजन किए जाने के लिए बातिष्ठ प्रस्ताव नियंत्रित (फ्यालिटी नियंत्रण और नियोजन) नियम, 1964 के नियम 11 के उपनियम (2) की अपेक्षान्वयन भारत सरकार के वाणिज्य मत्रालय के आदेश स० का० आ० 3541 तारीख 10 अक्टूबर 1979, के अधीन भारत के राजपत्र भाग 2, खंड 3, आंशुल (2) तारीख 20 अक्टूबर 1979 में प्रकाशित किए गए थे;

और राजपत्र में उक्त आदेश के प्रकाशन से 45 दिन के भीतर उससे प्रभावित होने वाले सभी व्यक्तियों से आक्षेप तथा मुमाल भागे गए थे;

और उक्त राजपत्र की प्रतिया जनता को 29 अक्टूबर 1979 को उपलब्ध करा दी गयी थी;

उक्त प्राप्त प्रस्तावों पर जनता से प्राप्त आक्षेपों और सुझावों पर केन्द्रीय सरकार ने विचार कर निया है;

अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार, नियंत्रित नियोजन परिषद् से परामर्श करने के पश्चात् यह गय होने पर कि भारत व्यापार के विकास के लिए ऐसा करना आवश्यक तथा समीचीन है, नियंत्रित (फ्यालिटी नियंत्रण और नियोजन अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 6 द्वारा प्रवत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने द्वारा, तथा भारत सरकार के वाणिज्य मत्रालय की अधिसूचना स० का० आ० 2376 तारीख 6 अगस्त, 1966 को अधिकान करने हुए:—

- (1) अधिसूचित करती है कि पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़े का नियंत्रित से पूर्व नियोजन किया जाएगा।
- (2) पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़े का नियंत्रित (नियोजन) नियम, 1980 के अनुमार नियोजन के प्रकार को नियोजन के उस प्रकार के रूप में विनिर्दिष्ट करती है, जो ऐसे पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़े को उसके नियंत्रित से पूर्व लागू होगा।
- (3) (क) नियंत्रित नियोजन परिषद् द्वारा मान्यताप्राप्त राष्ट्रीय और अंतर्राष्ट्रीय भानकों तथा अन्य सस्थाओं के मानकों को,
- (ख) इस आदेश के उपांग में विनिर्दिष्ट न्यूनतम विशेषताओं का समाधान करने वाले उत्पाद के सविदाकारी विनिर्देशों को,
- (ग) नियंत्रित द्वारा घोषित ऐसे विनिर्देशों को, जो नियंत्रित तथा विदेशी त्रेना के थीच, ऐसी नियंत्रित सविदाओं के लिए, जिनकी राजपत्र में इस आदेश के प्रकाशन की तारीख से पूर्व पुस्ति की गई है तथा उस तारीख से

आठ दिन की अवधि के भीतर नियंत्रित कर दिया गया है, नियंत्रित सविदा के विनिर्देशों के रूप में कारण पाण गए हैं, पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़े के लिए मानक विनिर्देशों के रूप में मान्यता देती है।

**टिप्पणी**—जब नियंत्रित सविदा व्यापार के विकास के लिए अपवाहित नहीं करती है या केवल नमूनों पर आधारित होती है, तब नियंत्रित करने के लिए विनिर्देश प्रस्तुत करने चाहिए।

(4) अंतर्राष्ट्रीय व्यापार के अनुक्रम में ऐसे पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़े के नियंत्रित का तब तक प्रतिविवृत्त करती है जब तक कि उसके साथ नियंत्रित (फ्यालिटी नियंत्रण और नियोजन) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 7 के अधीन स्थापित किसी नियंत्रित नियोजन अधिकारण द्वारा जारी किया गया इस आशय का प्रमाण पक्ष न हो कि ऐसा पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़ा नियंत्रित नियोजन नियम, 1980 के अनुमार नियंत्रित योग्य है या उस पर उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 8 के अधीन केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा मान्यताप्राप्त मुद्रा या चिन्ह लगा दिया गया है;

(2) इस आदेश की कोई भी बात—

(क) यू. बी. या समुद्र मार्ग द्वारा पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़े के भावी त्रेनाओं को नियंत्रित किए जाने वाले उन वास्तविक नमूनों को लागू नहीं होगी जिनका पोत पर्यंत निःशुल्क मूल्य 125/- मप्पे से अधिक नहीं है।

(ख) पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़े के ऐसे परेषण, जो राजपत्र में इस आदेश के प्रकाशन की तारीख के बुरंत पूर्व विनिर्दिष्ट या नियंत्रित करने के परिसर से जा जुके हो।

(3) इस आदेश में “पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़े” से कपास, पटमन, रेन, नायलोन या अन्य किसी संस्थिलट फैब्रिक से बना वह कपड़ा अधिभ्रेत है जिसके एक और या दोनों और उपर्युक्त संयोजित बाइनिल क्लोराइट बहुलक (पालिभर) या सहवहुलक का लेप किया गया है या परत चढ़ाई गई है।

(4) यह आदेश राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होगा।

### उपांग

पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़े के लिए न्यूनतम विनिर्देश

1. सामग्री तथा विनिर्दिष्ट (1) विनेपत (क) पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़े का विनिर्दिष्ट, मूल फैब्रिक पर एक या दोनों और उपर्युक्त संयोजित बाइनिल क्लोराइट बहुलक और सहवहुलक का एकमात्र लेप करके या परत चढ़ा कर किया जाएगा।

(ख) विनेपत यौगिक का संयोजन तैयार माल को अधिभित रूप तथा दृढ़ता देने के लिए होगा।

(ग) विनेपत न कूलने वाला और पिन छिद्रों तथा अन्य यांत्रिक दोषों से रहित होगा। यह चिपचिपा नहीं होगा और उसमें कोई उर्ध्वांश नहीं होगी।

**टिप्पणी** : जिल्हासाजी के प्रयोजन के लिए आवश्यक पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़ा श्रेणी ग के मानक में, पिन छिद्र यथापि दृष्टिगत हों परन्तु पानी प्रवेश नहीं अनुशेष होंगे।

2. मूल फैब्रिक—इस प्रयोजन के लिए प्रयुक्त मूल फैब्रिक अरणी क्लो-लिटी तथा बनावट का और मजबूत होगा। यह साफ होगा और बहुत तथा विनिर्दिष्ट संयोगी दोषों से युक्त नहीं होगा, जिससे कि परिष्कृत विनेपत के पक्षनात कोई मुख्य दोष दियाई न दें।

3 बाहूयाक्षुनि—मासमी, निम्नलिखित के संबंध में, सर्वथा श्रेणी के लिखित विनिर्देशों द्वा अनुमोदित नमूनों के अनुकूल होंगी

- (1) विलेपन या मूल फैक्ट्रिक का रंग अवश्य गोड़,
  - (2) विलेपन की डिजाइन, कण या प्रिट;
  - (3) सभी परिमित नीचे वर्गीकृत किन्तु मुख्य दोषों में रहिए होंगी, तथापि नीचे वर्गीकृत गोण दोषों को निम्नलिखित शर्तों के अवीन रहने दिया जाएगा :—
- (क) ये अनुकूल छोटे क्षेत्र में हों और इनमें संधारणतः उत्पाद के गुण धर्म या क्रियालिंग कम न होनी हों,
- (ख) पी० वी० सी० चर्म कपड़े की श्रेणी का और घ्र के लिए 40 मीटर या इसमें अधिक के लिए प्रत्येक रोल में अधिकतम 10 गोण दोष अनुकूल होंगे।

टिप्पणी :—श्रेणी ग के मामले में, पी० वी० सी० चर्म कपड़े जब जिलदारी के प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयुक्त किए जाते हैं, प्रत्येक मीटर में एक गोण दोष अनुकूल होंगा।

(ग) पी० वी० सी० चर्म कपड़े के मेजरोंशों की दशा में, निर्मित एक दर्जन मेजरोंशों में गोण दोष की अनुकूल हो जा सकेंगी।

#### मुख्य दोष का वर्गीकरण

- (1) खरोंच, कर्नल चिह्न तथा छिद्र।
- (2) नियमित अस्तरालों पर छाई दोषों की पुनरावृत्ति।
- (3) अनेपिल पेच/दाढ़ने।
- (4) जैनल लाइने तथा विराम चिह्न।
- (5) विलेपन समृद्धि पर छोड़ में विभिन्नता।
- (6) दोषपूर्ण किनारा जिससे न्यूनतम चौड़ाई प्रभावित होनी है।
- (7) चिपचिपी समृद्धि।
- (8) सध्य में या आसपास शिकने, जो लम्बाई में 10 मै० मी० से अधिक की है।
- (9) अरनम विलेपन।
- (10) असम उचितवरण, जो भौतिक बाहूयाक्षुनि पर प्रभाव डालता है।

#### गोण दोषों का वर्गीकरण—

- (1) तेज की बूंदों के चिह्न तथा धब्बे जिनका व्यास 10 मी० सी० तक है।
- (2) 10 सें०मी० तक की लम्बाई वाली विलेपन लाइने।
- (3) केन्द्रल श्रेणी के नया ख पी० वी० सी० चर्म कपड़े के लिए फैक्ट्रिक में बुनाई, गाठें, लम्के जिने तथा पूर्णिया डॉले धारे जैसे उत्पत्ति हुए दोषों में से गोण भुनाई दोष। जब यह जिलदारी के प्रयोजन के लिए प्रयुक्त होगा तो श्रेणी 'ग' पी० वी० सी० चर्म कपड़े में में दोष नहीं माने जाएंगे।
- (4) 10 सें० मी० से कम लम्बाई वाली शिकने।
- (5) मानक चौड़ाई से बाहर के दोष।
- (6) बार्डर का मिरां पर मुड़ा होना।
- (7) दोषपूर्ण किनारा जैसे काटा हुआ, विकृत, बुमायदार, छल्लेदार आदि जिससे न्यूनतम चौड़ाई प्रभावित नहीं होती है।
- (8) भौतिक बाहूयाक्षुनि को प्रभावित न करने वाली गिरनी और का विलेपन।
- (9) अल्प असम उचितवरण, जो भौतिक बाहूयाक्षुनि को प्रभावित करता है।
- (10) हल्की उधावित छाई, जो भौतिक बाहूयाक्षुनि को प्रभावित नहीं करती है।

(4) पी० वी० सी० चर्म कपड़े के गोणों या मेजरोंशों की विमाण श्रेणा द्वारा व्या विनिर्विष्ट होंगी। तथापि संधिदार्थक विनिर्देशों में, रोलों की चौड़ाई और मेजरोंशों के आकार में 5 प्रतिशत तक की छूट की अनुकूल होगी।

2. पी० वी० सी० विलेपन का भार तथा चर्म कपड़े का कुल भार

- (1) कुल भार :—पी० वी० सी० चर्म कपड़े की नीन श्रेणियों का न्यूनतम कुल भार ग्राम/वर्गमीटर में निम्नलिखित होगा।—

श्रेणी	ग्राम वर्गमीटर में न्यूनतम कुल भार
क	100
ख	300
ग	200

(2) पी० वी० सी० विलेपन—पी० वी० सी० विलेपन के बोंपित भार पर + 15 प्रतिशत तथा 5 प्रतिशत छूट की अनुकूल होगी।

3. विमंजन समर्थ—पी० वी० सी० चर्म कपड़े की नीन श्रेणियों की न्यूनतम विमंजन समर्थ निम्नलिखित होगी :—

श्रेणी	न्यूनतम विमंजन समृद्धि में मी० मी० में 5 चौड़ाई में साते की वशा में वाले की दशा में
क	30
ख	15
ग	12

टिप्पणी :—रेगेन की पीछिका में नियमित पी० वी० सी० चर्म कपड़े की दशा में और श्रेणी 'क' की काटिंग के साथ जैसे न्यूनतम 400 ग्राम प्रति वर्ग मीटर, साते की ओर न्यूनतम टूटन समर्थ 15 क्र० ग्रा० प्रति 5 सें० मी० चौड़ाई और वाले की ओर 12 क्र० ग्रा० प्रति 5 मै० मीटर चौड़ाई होगी।

4. नम्य विदारण का प्रतिरोध — विभिन्न श्रेणियों के लिए अधिकतम नम्य चक्रों की न्यूनतम संख्या निम्नलिखित होगी।

श्रेणी	नम्य चक्रों की संख्या
क	50,000
ख	30,000
ग	20,000

चक्रों की अनुबंधित संख्या के लिए अधिकतम रूप से नम्य करने के प्रस्ताव स्थानी यह सूनिश्चित करने होंगे लगाई जाएगी कि वह मूल फैक्ट्रिक तक न पहुँचे। तथापि नम्य विदारण के प्रतिरोध के लिए यह अतिव्यक्त नहीं है कि प्रत्येक परेपण का परीक्षण किया जाए। यह परोक्षण प्रत्येक नियोनकर्ता के लिए एक जैसी सामग्री के पांच परेपणों में एक बार किया जा सकता है।

5. पी० वी० सी० मेजरोंश—पी० वी० सी० सी० मेजरोंश, पी० वी० सी० सी० चर्म कपड़े का एक टुकड़ा है, जिसे मेजरोंशों के रूप में प्रयोग के लिए एक निश्चित आकार में काटा गया है। पी० वी० सी० मेजरोंश के निरीक्षण को प्रक्रिया साधारणतया बैंसी होंगी जैसा कि पी० वी० सी० चर्म कपड़े की है। पी० वी० सी० मेजरोंश की परीक्षा निम्नलिखित की दृष्टि में की जाएगी :—

(1) पी० वी० सी० विलेपन का भार और चर्म कपड़े का कुल भार।

(2) विमाण।

(3) डिजाइन, रंग तथा गोड़।

- (4) किनारों के पांग की परिमिति ।
- (5) मुख्य और गोल देख जो पी० बी० मी० चर्म कपड़े के लिए अधिकृत किए गए हैं ।

6. **पैकेज :**—पैकेज का छंग केवा द्वारा यथा विनिर्दिष्ट होगा । रोलों के पैकेज बंडल भली प्रकार तथा मजबूती से बाधे जाएंगे जिससे कि उनके आकार में परिवर्तन न हो सके । पैकेजों को जल गेही पालिथीन या पी० बी० मी० गोट से ढका जाएगा जिससे कि उनकी अन्तर्बस्तुओं का वातावरण सहज से प्रशिरक्षण किया जा सके ।

[म० 6(42)/72--नि० नि० तथा नि० ३०]

**S.O. 48.**—Whereas for the development of the export trade of India certain proposals for subjecting P. V. C. leather cloth to quality control and inspection prior to export were published as required by sub-rule (2) of rule 11 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1964, in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, Sub Section (ii) dated the 20th October, 1979 under the Order of the Government of India in the Ministry of Commerce No. S. O. 3541 dated the 20th October, 1979.

And whereas the objections and suggestions were invited from all persons likely to be affected thereby; within 45 days of the publication of the said Order in the official Gazette.

And whereas the copies of the said Gazette were made available to the public on the 20th October, 1979;

And whereas the objections and suggestions received from the public on the said draft proposals have been considered by the Central Government;

Now, therefore, the Central Government, after consultation with the Export Inspection Council, being of opinion that it is necessary and expedient so to do for the development of the export trade of India, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 6 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963) and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Commerce No. S. O. 2376 dated the 6th August, 1966, hereby :—

- (1) notifies that P. V. C. leather cloth shall be subject to inspection prior to export.
- (2) specifies the type of inspection in accordance with the Export of P. V. C. Leather Cloth (Inspection) Rules, 1981 as the type of inspection which shall be applied to such P. V. C. leather cloth prior to their export.
- (3) recognises :—
  - (a) national and international standards and standards of other bodies recognised by Export Inspection Council.
  - (b) contractual specifications subject to the product satisfying the minimum of the characteristics specified in the Annexure to this order; and
  - (c) the specifications declared by the exporter to be the agreed specifications of the export contract between the foreign buyer and the exporter, for such export contracts as are confirmed prior to the date of publication of the order in the official Gazette and exported within a period of sixty days from that date;

As the standard specifications for P. V. C. leather cloth :

**Note :**

When the export contract does not indicate detailed technical requirements or based only on samples, the exporter should furnish a written down specification.

- (4) Prohibits the export in the course of international trade of PVC leather cloth unless the same is either accompanied by a certificate of inspection issued by any of the Export Inspection Agencies established under section 7 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963) to the effect that the PVC leather cloth is export worthy in accordance with the Export of PVC Leather Cloth

(Inspection) Rules, 1980 or is affixed with a seal or mark recognised by the Central Government under section 8 of the Act.

2. Nothing in this order shall apply to the export of—

- (a) bona fide samples of P. V. C. leather cloth not exceeding Rs. 125.00 only in Free-on-Board value to the prospective buyers by land, sea or air,
- (b) consignments of P. V. C. leather cloth which might have already left the premises of the exporter or manufacturer immediately prior to the date of publication of this Order in the official Gazette.

3. In this order "P. V. C. leather cloth" means cloth made of cotton, jute, rayon, nylon or any other synthetic fabric to which a layer of suitably compounded vinyl chloride polymer or copolymer is applied either on one or on both sides by coating or lamination.

4. This order shall come into force on the date of its publication in the official Gazette.

#### ANNEXURE

##### Minimum specifications of P.V.C. Leather Cloth

###### 1. Material and manufacture

(1) Coating—(a) P. V. C. Leather cloth shall be manufactured by coating uniformly or by lamination on one or both sides of the basic fabric a layer of suitably compounded vinyl chloride polymer or copolymer,

(b) the composition of the coating compound shall be to import the finished product the desired appearance and strength.

(c) the coating shall be non blooming, free from pin holes and other mechanical defects. It shall not be tacky and shall not have disagreeable odour.

Note : In case of Grade-C P. V. C. Leather cloth meant for book binding purposes, the pin-holes although visible but not permeable to water, will be allowed.

(2) Basic fabric—The basic fabric used for this purpose shall be of good quality, construction and strength. It shall be clean and reasonably free from weaving and manufacturing defects so that no major visual defects are observed on the finished coating.

(3) Appearance—The material shall conform strictly to the buyer's written down specifications or approved samples in respect of

(i) colour or shade of the coating or basic fabric.

(ii) design, grain or print of the coating.

(viii) Creases in the centre or there about more than defects as classified below. The minor defects, classified below, shall however be allowed under the conditions that—

(a) these are localised to very small areas and do not generally impair the properties or quality of the product;

(b) Maximum of 10 minor defects may be allowed in each roll of 40 metres or more for Grade-A and B P. V. C. leather cloth.

Note : In case of Grade-C P. V. C. leather cloth when used for book binding proposes, one minor defect per metre will be allowed.

(c) in case of table covers of P. V. C. leather cloth one minor defect may be allowed in one dozen pieces inspected.

'Classification of minor defects :

(i) Scratches, cutting marks and holes.

(ii) Printing defects repeated at regular intervals.

(iii) Uncoated patches/lines.

(iv) Channel lines and stop marks.

(v) Shade variation on coated surface.

(vi) Defective selvedge affecting the minimum width.

(vii) Tacky surface.

- (viii) Creases in the centre or their about more than 10cms in length.
- (ix) Uneven coating.
- (x) Uneven embossing which affects the physical appearance.

**Classification of minor defects :**

- (i) Presence of marks of oil drops and stains up to 10 mm in diameter.
- (ii) Coating lines of length upto 10 cms.
- (iii) Minor weaving defects arising out of defects in the fabric like weaving, knots, long ends and slubs, loose threads kitties for Grade-A and B P. V. C. leather cloth only. These may not be considered as defects in Grade-C P. V. C. leather cloth when the same is required to be used for book binding purposes.
- (iv) Small creases less than 10 cm in length.
- (v) Faults outside the standard width.
- (vi) Border folded at the ends.
- (vii) Defective selvedge not affecting the minimum width e.g. cut distorted, loppy, curled etc.
- (viii) Backside coating not affecting the physical appearance.
- (ix) Slight uneven embossing not affecting the physical appearance.
- (x) Slightly flushed print out affecting the physical appearance.
- (4) Dimensions of P.V.C. leather cloth rolls or table cloth shall be as specified by the buyer. A tolerance upto 5 per cent shall, however, be permitted on the contractual specifications in respect of the width of the rolls or size of the table cloth.

**2. Weights of P.V.C. coating and total weight of leather cloth.**

- (i) Total weight:—The minimum total weight in gms./sq. metre of three grades of P.V.C. leather cloth shall be as follows:

Grade	Minimum total weight in gms./sq.mt.
A	400
B	300
C	200

- (ii) P.V.C. coating—A tolerance of plus 15 per cent and—5 per cent shall be allowed on declared P.V.C. coating weight.

**3. Breaking strength—**The minimum breaking strength of three grades of P.V.C. leather cloth shall be as follows:

Grade	Minimum Breaking strength in kg./5 cm. width	Weft direction
A	30	25
B	15	15
C	12	10

**Note :** In case of P.V.C. leather cloth manufactured with Rayon background and having coating of A grade i.e. minimum of 400 grams per square metre, and 12 Kg. per 5 cm. width in weft direction.

**4. Resistance to flex cracking:**—The minimum of continuous flexing cycles for different D grades shall be as under :

Grade	No. of flexing cycles
A	50,000
B	30,000
C	20,000

After continuous flexing for the stipulated number of cycles ink shall be applied to ensure that the same does not percolate upto the basic fabric. However, the test resistance to flex cracking need not be done on every consignment. This test could be done once in five consignments of similar materials for each exporter.

**5. P.V.C. table cloth:**—P.V.C. table cloth is a piece of P.V.C. leather cloth, cut into a definite size for use as table covers. The procedure to be followed for inspection of P.V.C. table cloth shall in general, be the same as for P.V.C. leather cloth. The P.V.C. table cloth shall be examined for:—

- (i) weights of P.V.C. coating and total weight of leather cloth.
- (ii) dimensions.
- (iii) design, colour and shade.
- (iv) finish along the selvedges.
- (v) major and minor defects as laid down for P.V.C. leather cloth.

**6. Packing :** Mode of packing shall be as specified by the buyer: The packages as bundles containing the rolls shall be well closed and sturdy enough to retain shape. The packages shall be covered with water proof paper, polythene or P.V.C. sheeting to protect the contents from environmental hazards.

[No. 6(42)/72-EI&EP]

**का० अ० 49.—** केंद्रीय मरकार नियंत्रण और नियोजन अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शब्दों का प्रयोग करते हुए, और पी० सी० सी० चर्म कपड़ा नियंत्रण (नियोजन) नियम, 1966 का अधिकरण करते हुए, नियंत्रित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात् :—

1. संक्षिप्त नाम और प्रारम्भ :—(1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम पी० सी० सी० चर्म कपड़ा नियंत्रण (नियोजन) नियम, 1981 है,

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख को प्रवत्त होंगे।

2. परिभाषा—इन नियमों में, जब तक कि संदर्भ से, अन्यथा अपेक्षित न हो :—

(क) “अधिनियम” से (नियंत्रण कावलीटी नियंत्रण और नियोजन) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) अभिप्रेत है :—

(ख) “अभिकरण” से अधिनियम की धारा 7 के अधीन कलकत्ता, मुम्बई, दिल्ली, मद्रास तथा कोची में स्थापित अभिकरणों में से कोई अभिकरण अभिप्रेत है।

(ग) “परिचय” से इन अधिनियम की धारा 3 के अधीन स्थापित नियंत्रण नियोजन परिचय अभिप्रेत है।

(घ) “पी० सी० सी० चर्म कपड़े” से कपास, पटमन, रेपन, नायलोन या अन्य किसी सशिल्प फैक्ट्रिय से बना ऐसा कपड़ा अभिप्रेत है जिसके एक ओर या दोनों ओर उपयुक्त संयोजित आहनिक कठोराइड घटवक (पालिमर) या सहवृक्षक का लेप किया गया है या परत चढ़ाई गई है।

(ङ) “अनुसूची” से इन नियमों से संलग्न अनुसूची अभिप्रेत है।

3. नियोजन का आधार :—पी० सी० सी० चर्म कपड़े का नियोजन यह बेखतों के विभार से किया जाएगा कि नियंत्रण के लिए पी० सी० सी० चर्म कपड़े का परेण्य, अधिनियम की धारा 6 के अधीन केंद्रीय मरकार

द्वारा मान्यता प्राप्त विनिर्देशों के अनुसूचि हैं या नहीं, अधीन (क) नियम निरीक्षण परियोग द्वारा साम्या प्राप्त राष्ट्रीय और अंतर्राष्ट्रीय मानक तथा अन्य संस्थाओं के मानक, (य) अधिनियम की धारा 6 के अधीन इस आवेदन के उपांचाल में विनिर्दिष्ट सूनतम विषेषताओं का समाधान करने वाले उसाद के मानविकारी विनिर्देश, (ग) नियन्त्रिता द्वारा घोषित ऐसे विनिर्देशों के मध्य में, ऐसी नियम संविदाओं के लिए जिनकी राजपत्र में इस आवेदन के प्रकाशन की तारीख से पूर्व गुप्त की रही है तथा उस तारीख से मात्र दिन की अवधि के भीतर नियम कर दिया गया है, करार पाए गए हों।

4. निरीक्षण की प्रक्रिया :—(1)(क) पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़े का नियंत्रित करने का आशय रखने वाला नियन्त्रिकर्ता, पोन भरण की प्रत्यायित तारीख से कम पाँच दिन पहले, अपने ऐसा करने के आशय की विनियम जानकारी देगा तथा नियंत्रित संविदा में, अनुबूद्धित विनिर्देशों के अनुसार, उसी वर्लिटी तथा डिजाइन के पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़े के जो नियंत्रित लिए जाने के लिए आशयित हैं, नमूनों के साथ एक आवेदन उम अधिकरण को देगा जिसकी अधिकारिता में विनिर्माता का परिवर्त या वह परिवर्त स्थित है जहाँ निरीक्षण के लिए मान प्रस्तुत किया जाता है जिससे कि अधिकरण नियम 3 के अनुसार निरीक्षण कर राहे।

(ख) आवेदन में निम्ननियन्त्रित के संबंध में नमूने के विनिर्देशों को उप-दर्शित किया जाएगा।—

- (ज) विलोग का भार तथा पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़े का कुल भार;
- (ii) कपड़े की विमाण, चौड़ाई, बुनावट, क्वालिटी तथा रंग या शेष;
- (iii) विभेजन समर्थन तथा नम्य विदारण के लिए प्रतिरोध।

(2) उप नियम (1) के अधीन नमूने के साथ सूचना तथा आवेदन प्राप्त होने पर अधिकरण, नियंत्रित निरीक्षण परियोग द्वारा नियम 3 के अनुसार समय-समय पर जारी किए गए अनुदेशों के अनुसार पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़े के परेपण का नियंत्रण करेगा। नमूना लेने के मापदंड तथा परीक्षण की रीत इन नियमों से उपायत्र अनुसूची के अनुसार होगी।

(3) यदि निरीक्षण के पश्चात् अधिकरण का यह समाधान नहीं होता वहाँ वह उस दिन की अवधि के भीतर ऐसा प्रमाणपत्र देने से इकार कर देगा तथा ऐसे इकार की सूचना उसके कारणों सहित, नियन्त्रित को देगा :

परन्तु जहाँ अधिकरण का ऐसा समाधान नहीं होता वहाँ वह उस दिन की अवधि के भीतर ऐसा प्रमाणपत्र देने से इकार कर देगा।

5. मान्यताप्राप्त चिह्न का लगाया जाना और उसके लिए प्रक्रिया :— नियंत्रित के लिए आशयित पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़े पर मान्यता प्राप्त चिह्न या मुद्रा लगाने की प्रक्रिया के संबंध में, भारतीय मानक संस्था (प्रमाणन चिह्न) नियम, 1952 (1952 का 36) भारतीय मानक संस्था (प्रमाणन चिह्न) नियम, 1955 तथा भारतीय मानक संस्था (प्रमाणन चिह्न) विनियम, 1955 के उपर्यंत, जहाँ तक हो सके, लागू होंगे।

6. निरीक्षण का स्थान .—इन नियमों के अधीन प्रत्येक निरीक्षण या तो .—

- (i) मान के विनिर्माता के परिवर्त पर किया जाएगा; या
- (ii) उन परिवर्तों पर किया जाएगा जहाँ निरीक्षण के लिए नियंत्रित कर्ता द्वारा मान प्रस्तुत किया जाता है, परन्तु यह जब कि इस प्रयोजन के लिए वहाँ पर्याप्त सुविधाएँ हैं।

7. निरीक्षण की कीस .—इन नियमों के अधीन ऐसे प्रत्येक परेपण के लिए पोन-पर्यंत निष्कृत मूल्य के प्रत्येक एक सौ रुपये के लिए तीस विनियम की दर से निरीक्षण कीस दी जाएगी किन्तु प्रत्येक परेपण के लिए यह कीस कम से कम 15 रुपये और अधिक से अधिक 200 रुपये होगी।

यदि नियंत्रिकर्ता पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़े के एक ही क्षमतियों के द्वारा या अधिक परेपण किनी विषेष तारीख को प्रमुख करना है तो ऐसे मध्ये परेपणों का नियंत्रण मान-माय एक लाट के रूप में किया जाएगा और एक माय जोड़े गए ऐसे परेपणों की नियंत्रण कीस उनके पोन-पर्यंत निष्कृत कुल मूल्य के आधार पर ली जाएगी और यह कम से कम 15 रुपये होगी। दूसरे शब्दों में इन परेपणों के लिए नियंत्रण कीमत अन्तर्गत अलग नहीं रही जाएगी।

8. अप्रैल.—(1) नियम 4 के उपनियम (3) के अधीन प्रमाण-पत्र देने से अधिकरण द्वारा इकार किए जाने से व्यायाम कोई व्यक्ति, उसके विनियम अपील, इस प्रकार इकार किए जाने की सूचना प्राप्त होने से इस विनियम के भीतर, केन्द्रीय भरकार द्वारा इस प्रमाणन के लिए नियुक्त विषेषज्ञों के पैनल का कार सकेगा जिसमें कम से कम तीन और अधिक से अधिक सात व्यक्ति होंगे।

(2) विषेषज्ञों के पैनल की कुल सदस्य संख्या के कम से कम दो निहाई सदस्य, गैर-सरकारी होंगे।

(3) पैनल की गणतान्त्री तीन सदस्यों में होंगी।

(4) अपील का निपटारा, उसके प्राप्त होने से, पहले ही दिन के भीतर कर दिया जाएगा।

### अनुसूची

#### [नियम 4(2) देखिए]

##### 1. नमूना लेने के मापदंड

1.1 यदि नियंत्रित संविदा में अन्यथा विनिर्दिष्ट न हो तो निरीक्षण के लिए प्रत्यापित परेपणों के विभिन्न लाटों में से पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़े के प्रतिनिधि नमूने लेने के लिए एक साथ प्रत्येक लाट में से नियंत्रित वाले वर्णनों/पैकेजों की न्यूनतम संख्या नीचे दी गई सारणी-1 के अनुसार होंगी।—

##### नमूना लेने के मापदंड

##### मारणी—1

प्रस्तावित बंडलों/पैकेजों की संख्या  
(लाट इकार)

एक साथ लेने जाने वाले बंडलों/  
पैकेजों की संख्या

10 तक	1
11 से 50 तक	2
51 से 100 तक	3
101 से 200 तक	4
201 से 300 तक	5
301 तक तथा उससे अधिक	7

टिप्पणी—इस संदर्भ में लाट से एक ही श्रेणी तथा क्षमतियों के पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़े के एक साथ लाए गए सभी रोप अधिकतम होंगे। एक सौ लाट में अलग-अलग डिजाइन तथा रंग भी हो सकते हैं।

1.2 नमूने ऐसे लिए जाएंगे कि उनमें प्रत्येक आकार, डिजाइन तथा रंग भी काफ़ी नहीं रहे।

1.3 ऊपर मारणी के अनुसार किसी लाट में से लेने गए बंडलों/पैकेजों में के प्रत्येक रोप की :—

(क) नियन्त्रित की घोषणा के अनुसार, उसकी चौड़ाई के लिए परीक्षण की जाएगी।

(ब) नियोनकर्ता द्वारा प्रस्तुत किए गए अनुमोदित नमूने के अनुसार पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़े के रंग तथा डिजाइन की परीक्षा बी० जाएगी।

(ग) अधिनियम की धारा 6 के अधीन, आवेदन के उपचंद्र के खंड-1 (3) के अधीन किए गए अभिकरण के अनुसार मुख्य तथा गंण वोयों का धारा में रखते हुए, रोलों का निरीक्षण किया जाएगा।

1. 4 इस प्रकार निरीक्षण किए गए उक्त रोलों में से प्रयोगशाला परीक्षण के लिए नमूना लेने के निम्नलिखित मापदंड यथातः जारीः—

निरीक्षण जारी वाले

	नमूने
50 तक	2
51 से 100 तक	3
101 से 300 तक	5
301 तथा उससे अधिक	7

1. 5 प्रयोगशाला परीक्षण के लिए नमूनों के दो सेट लिए जाएंगे। यदि नमूनों का एक सेट अपेक्षित विनिर्देशों के अनुकूल नहीं है तो इस प्रकार लिए गए दूसरे सेट का परीक्षण किया जाएगा और परेपण की नियत योग्यता या अन्यथा उसके अनुसार मुनिश्वत की जाएगी।

1. 6 नमूनों के दो सेट लेने के लिए, नमूने विभिन्न रोलों से (यदि अपेक्षित हो तो, बुने हुए बंडलों तथा अतिरिक्त बंडलों में से) भी यद् मुनिश्वत करने हुए लिए जारी कि अधिक से अधिक यथा संभव रंगों तथा डिजाइनों के नमूने प्राप्त हो जाएँ।

2. पी० बी० सी० मेज पोशाक :

2. 1 पी० बी० सी० मेजपोशाक का सम्पूर्ण परेपण, नमूना लेने के प्रयोगजन के लिए, विभिन्न लौटों में बाटा जाएगा। इस संबंध में लौट से समान श्रेणी तथा क्वार्टिटो के सभी टुकड़े अप्रिवेत हैं।

2. 2 नीचे दिए गए नमूना लेने के मापदंड के अनुसार निरीक्षण करने के लिए नमूना लेने के लिए कम से कम पात्र प्रतिष्ठन पैकेज; किन्तु दो पैकेज से कम नहीं, खोले जाएंगे।

2. 3 नमूने हम कुंग से लिए जाएंगे कि उसमें प्रत्येक आकार, डिजाइन तथा शेड का नमूना आ जाए।

#### नमूना लेने का मापदंड

लौट में मेजपोशों की संख्या	प्रत्यक्ष निरी- प्रयोगशाला परीक्षण के लिए, धरण के लिए, लिए जाने वाले मेजपोशों की लिए जाने वाले मेज पोशाकों की संख्या		
(1)	(2)	3(क)	3(ख)
300 तक	10	1	3
301 से 600 तक	15	2	4
601 से 1200 तक	20	2	5
1201 तथा उससे अधिक	25	3	6

टिप्पण :—उस स्तरम् 3(ब) उस पी० बी० सी० सी० चर्म कपड़े के एक ही रोल के विभिन्न विश्रुतों से पी० बी० सी० मेजपोशों के लिए ली जाने वाली उन पट्टियों की संख्या बताना है, जिनमें से परेपण के मेजपोश बनाए गए हैं। नियोनकर्ता से प्रत्येक मामले में यह घोषणा अवश्य प्राप्त कर ली जानी चाहिए कि ये कट्टीय उसी क्वार्टिटो के हैं जिसके कि मेजपोश हैं। इन कट्टीयों और ऊपर स्तरम् 3 (क) के अनुसार परेपण में से लिए गए पूरे परिमाप के मेजपोशों का, प्रयोगशाला परीक्षण किया जाएगा और जहाँ तक प्रयोगशाला परीक्षणों का संबंध है, औसत परिणामों से की नियत योग्यता मुनिश्वत की जाएगी।

3. परीक्षण-नड़ति.—यदि निर्यात संविदा में अन्यथा विनियोग नहीं है तो परीक्षण प्रक्रिया, राष्ट्रीय मानक के अनुगार होगी। यह सुनिश्चित करने के लिए नमूनों का यसी प्रकार परीक्षण किया जाएगा कि परेपण इस प्रयोजन के लिए मात्रा प्राप्त मानक विनिर्देशों की अपेक्षाओं के अनुरूप हैं।

[मं० 6(42)/72-नि० नि० तथा नि० उ०]

**S.O. 49.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963) and in supersession of the Export of P.V.C. Leather Cloth (Inspection) Rules, 1966 the Central Government hereby makes the following rules, namely :—

1. Short title and commencement.—(1) These rules may be called the Export of P. V. C. Leather Cloth (Inspection) Rules, 1981.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the official Gazette.

2. Definitions : In this rule, unless the context otherwise requires :—

(a) "Act" means the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963).

(b) "Agency" means any one of the agencies established at Calcutta, Bombay, Delhi, Madras and Cochin under section 7 of the Act.

(c) "Council" means the Export Inspection Council established under section 3 of the Act;

(d) "PVC leather cloth" means cloth made of cotton, jute, rayon, nylon or any other synthetic fabric to which a layer of suitably compounded vinyl chloride polymer or copolymer is applied either on one or on both sides by coating or lamination.

(e) "Schedule" means a Schedule appended to these rules.

3. Basis of inspection.—Inspection of P. V. C. leather cloth shall be carried out with a view to seeing that the consignment of P.V.C. leather cloth intended for export conforms to the specifications recognised by the Central Government under section 6 of the Act, namely (a) national and international standards and standards of other bodies recognised by Export Inspection Council (b) contractual specifications subject to the product satisfying the minimum of the characteristics specified in the Annexure to the order under section 6 of the Act, and (c) the specifications declared by the exporter to be the agreed specifications of the export contract between the foreign buyer and the exporter, for such export contracts as are confirmed prior to the date of publication of this order in the Official Gazette and exported within a period of sixty days from that date.

4. Procedure of inspection.—(1) (a) An exporter intending to export P. V. C. leather cloth shall not less than five days before the expected date of shipment, give information in writing of his intention so to do and submit an application along with the sample of PVC leather cloth of the same quality and design as is intended to be exported in accordance with the specifications stipulated in the export contract to the Agency within whose jurisdiction the premises of the manufacturer or the premises where the goods are offered for inspection are situated in order to enable it to carry out the inspection in accordance with rule 3.

(b) The application shall also indicate the specifications of the sample in respect of :—

(i) the weight of coating and total weight of PVC leather cloth;

(ii) the dimension, width, texture of the piece, quality and colour or shade

(iii) the breaking strength and resistance to flex cracking.

(2) On receipt of the intimation and application along with the sample under sub-rule (1), the agency shall inspect the consignment of PVC leather cloth as per the instructions issued by the Export Inspection Council from time to time and in accordance with rule 3. The sampling criteria and methods of test shall be as per the schedule annexed to these rules.

(3) If after inspection, the agency is satisfied that the consignment of PVC leather cloth conforms to the declaration relating to the consignment, it shall within five days, issue a certificate declaring the consignment as exportworthy.

Provided that were the agency is not so satisfied, it shall, within the said period of five days, refuse to issue such certificate and communicate such refusal to the exporters along with reasons therefor.

5. Affixation of recognised mark and procedure therefor.—The Provisions of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Act, 1952 (36 of 1952), the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Rules 1955 and the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Regulation 1955 shall, so far as may, apply in relation to the procedure of affixation of the recognised mark or seal on P. V. C. leather cloth meant for export.

6. Place of inspection :—Every inspection under these rules shall be carried out either :—

- (i) at the premises of the manufacturer of the goods, or
- (ii) at the premises at which the goods are offered by the exporter for inspection provided adequate facilities for the purpose exist therein

7. Inspection fee—subject to a minimum of Rs. 15/- and a maximum of Rs. 200/- for each consignment, a fee at the rate of thirty paise for every hundred rupees of the f.o.b. value for each such consignment shall be paid as inspection fee under these rules.

In case the exporter offers two or more consignments of P. V. C. leather cloth of the same quality for inspection on a particular date, all such consignments shall be inspected simultaneously as one lot and the inspection fee shall be charged on the basis of f.o.b. value of such consignments added together subject to the minimum of Rs. 15/-. In other words the inspection fee shall not be charged for each of these consignments separately.

8. Appeal—(1) Any person aggrieved by the refusal of the Agency to issue a certificate under sub rule (3) of rule 4, may within ten days of the receipt of the communication of such refusal by him, prefer appeal to the panel of experts consisting of not less than three but not more than seven persons, appointed for the purpose by the Central Government.

(2) At least two thirds of the total membership of the panel of experts shall consist of non-officials.

(3) The quorum of the Panel shall be three.

(4) The appeal shall be disposed of within fifteen days of its receipt.

#### SCHEDULE

[See rule 4(2)]

##### 1. Sampling criteria

1.1. For drawing representative samples of the P.V.C. leather cloth from various lots in the consignment offered for inspection minimum number of bundles of packages to be selected from each lot at random shall be in accordance with Table-I given below if not otherwise specified in the export contract :—

##### Scale of Sampling

TABLE—I

No. of bundles/packages offered (lot size)	No. of bundles/packages to be selected at random
Up to 10	1
11 to 50	2
51 to 100	3
101 to 200	4
201 to 300	5
301 and above	7

Note.—A lot in this context shall mean all the rolls of the P.V.C. leather cloth of the same grade and quality grouped together. There may be different designs and colours in the same lot

1.2 The samples shall be so drawn that each size, design and shade is well represented as far as possible.

1.3 Each of the rolls contained in the bundles/packages thus selected from the same lot according to the above table shall be examined :—

- (a) for width, according to the declaration of the exporter.
- (b) for colour and design of the P.V.C. leather cloth in accordance with the approved sample submitted by the exporter.
- (c) The rolls shall be inspected keeping in view the major and minor defects, as classified under clause 1 (3) of the annexure of the Order under section 6 of the Act.

1.4 From the above rolls, thus examined, the following scale of sampling shall be followed for laboratory tests :—

No. of rolls in the lot	Samples to be taken
Up to 50	2
51 to 100	3
101 to 300	5
301 and above	7

1.5 A duplicate set of samples shall be drawn for laboratory testing. In case first set of samples do not conform to the required specifications then the duplicate set of samples so drawn shall be tested and export-worthiness or otherwise of the consignment shall be decided accordingly.

1.6 For drawing duplicate set of samples, samples from different rolls (from the selected bundles and also additional bundles, if required) shall be drawn ensuring coverage of as many colours and designs as possible.

##### 2. P.V.C. table cloth

2.1 The whole consignment of P.V.C. table cloth shall be divided into various lots for sampling purpose. A lot in this context means all the pieces of the same grade and quality.

2.2 At least 5 per cent of the packages, subject to a minimum of two shall be opened for drawing samples for inspection as per the scale of sampling given below.

2.3 The samples shall be so drawn that each size, design and shade is well represented.

##### Scale of Sampling

No. of Table cloths in the lot	No. of table cloths to be drawn for visual inspection	No. of table cloths to be drawn for laboratory tests	
(1)	(2)	3(a)	3(b)
Up to 300	10	1	3
301 to 600	15	2	4
601 to 1200	20	2	5
1201 and above	25	3	6

Note.—Column 3(b) above, give the number of strips of P.V.C. table cloth to be drawn from different points on the same roll of P.V.C. leather cloth out of which the table cloths of the consignment have been fabricated. The exporter's declaration that these cut pieces are of the same quality as the table cloths should invariably be obtained in each case. The cut pieces shall be put to laboratory tests together with the all size table cloth drawn from the consignment as per column 3(a) above and the average results shall determine the export worthiness, so far as laboratory testings are involved.

3. Methods of testing.—If not otherwise specified in the export contract the testing procedure shall be as per National Standard. The samples shall be subjected to all tests to ensure the conformity of the consignment with the requirements of standard specifications recognised for the purpose.

[No. 6(42)/72-EI&EP]

**का० आ० 50।**—केन्द्रीय सरकार नियति (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और नियोजन) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 7 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और भारत के राजपत्र, भ्रष्टाचारण, भाग, 2, खंड 3, उपखंड (ii) तारीख 6 अगस्त, 1966 में प्रकाशित भारत सरकार के वाणिज्य मंत्रालय की अधिकृति भूकृता संदर्भ का० आ० 2378 का अधिकारण करते हुए निम्नलिखित अभिकरणों को पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़े के, उम्मेद नियति में पूर्व, नियोजन के लिए मान्यता देती है, अर्थात्—

1. नियति नियोजन अभिकरण-कलकत्ता,

बर्लंड ट्रेड सेल्सर,

1/वी० एग्रा स्ट्रीट (एट्ट्य फ्लॉर)

कलकत्ता-700001

2. नियति नियोजन अभिकरण-मद्रास,

123, मार्टंड रोड,

मद्रास-600006

3. नियति नियोजन अभिकरण-कोचीन,

मनोहर बिल्डिंग, महाराष्ट्रा गार्डी रोड,

गारनाकुलम, कोचीन-11.

4. नियति नियोजन अधिकरण-मुम्बई,

प्रमन चैम्बर्स (फोर्थ फ्लॉर)

113, महार्षि कार्वे रोड,

मुम्बई-400004.

5. नियति नियोजन अभिकरण-दिल्ली,

म्यूल्टिसिपल मार्केट बिल्डिंग,

3, मरम्बती मार्ग, करोल बाग,

नई दिल्ली-110005.

**स्पष्टीकरण।**—इस अनुदेश में पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़े से कपास, पटसन, रेयन, नायलोन या अन्य किसी मंशिलष्ट कपड़े से बना वह कपड़ा अधिकृत है जिसके एक ओर या दोनों ओर उपयुक्त मंयोजित बाह्यित कलोराइड बहुलक (पालिमर) या भृष्टबहुलक का लेप किया गया है या परत छाई गई है।

[मा० 6 (42)/72-नि० नथा नि० ई०उ०]

**S.O. 50.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 7 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963) and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Commerce No. S.O. 2378 published in the Gazette of India Extraordinary, Part II, section 3, Sub Section (ii) dated the 6th August, 1966, the Central Government, hereby, recognises the following agencies for inspection of PVC leather cloth prior to its export, namely :—

1. Export Inspection Agency-Cuttack World Trade Centre, 14/1B Ezra Street (8th Floor) Cuttack-700001.
2. Export Inspection Agency-Madras 123, Mount Road, Madras-600006.
3. Export Inspection Agency-Cochin, Manohar Building, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Ernakulam, Cochin-11.
4. Export Inspection Agency-Bombay Aman Chambers (4th floor), 113, M. Karve Road, Bombay-400 004.
5. Export Inspection Agency-Delhi, Municipal Market Building, 3, Saraswati Marg, Karol Bagh, New Delhi-110005.

**Explanation—**In this notification P. V. C. leather cloth means cloth made of cotton, Jute, rayon, nylon or any other synthetic fabric to which a layer of suitably compounded vinyl chloride polymer or copolymer is applied either on one or on both sides by coating or lamination.

[No. 6(42)/72-EI&EP]

**का० आ० 51।**—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने नियति (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और नियोजन) अधिनियम 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 8 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए नियति (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और नियोजन) नियम, 1964 के नियम 11 के उत्तराधि (2) द्वारा अनुकूल रूप में पी० बी० सी० चर्म के कपड़े के संबंध में भारतीय मानक संस्था प्रमाणित चिह्न को मान्यता देने के लिए एक प्रस्ताव भारत सरकार के वाणिज्य मंत्रालय के आदेश सं० का० आ० 3542 तारीख 20 अक्टूबर 1979 के अधीन भारत के राजपत्र भाग 2, खंड 3 उपखंड (ii) नामीख 20 अक्टूबर, 1979 में प्रकाशित किया था।

और उक्त अधिमंचन के राजपत्र में प्रकाशित की भारीख से 45 दिन के भीतर उन सभी व्यक्तियों से आवेदन और सुझाव मार्गे गए थे, जिनके उम्मेद प्रभावित होने की संभावना थी।

और उक्त राजपत्र की प्रतिया 29 अक्टूबर, 1979 को जनता को उपलब्ध करा दी गई थी।

और केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उक्त प्राप्ति पर जनता से प्राप्त आवेदनों और सुझावों पर विचार कर लिया है।

**अब:** अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार नियति (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और नियोजन) अधिनियम, 1963 की धारा 8 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़े के संबंध में भारतीय मानक संस्था प्रमाणित चिह्न को यह घोषित करते के प्रयोगत के लिए मान्यता देती है कि जहाँ पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़े पर ऐसा चिह्न चिपकाया या लगाया जाता है, वहाँ यह समझा जाएगा कि वह उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 6 के खंड (3) के अधीन उम्मेद लागू मानक विनियमों के अनुरूप है।

**स्पष्टीकरण—**इस आदेश में पी० बी० सी० चर्म कपड़े से कपास, पटसन, रेयन, नायलोन या अन्य किसी संशिलष्ट केत्रिक से बना। वह कपड़ा अधिकृत है जिसके एक ओर या दोनों ओर उपयुक्त संयोजित बाह्यित कलोराइड बहुलक (पालिमर) या भृष्टबहुलक का लेप किया गया है या परत छाई गई है।

[मा० 6 (42)/72-नि० नथा नि० उ०] सी० बी० शुक्रवारी, संयुक्त निदेशक

**S.O. 51.**—Whereas the Central Government in exercise of the powers conferred by section 8 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963) published a proposal to recognise the Indian Standards Institution Certification Mark in relation to P. V. C. leather cloth as required by sub-rule (2) of rule 11 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1964 in the Gazette of India, Part II-Section 3-sub-section (ii), dated the 20th October 1979, under the Order of the Government of India in the Ministry of Commerce No. S.O. 3542, dated the 20th October, 1979.

And whereas objections and suggestions were invited from all persons likely to be affected thereby within 45 days from the date of publication of the said notification in the official Gazette.

And whereas the copies of the said Gazette were made available to the public on the 29th October, 1979.

And whereas the objections and suggestions received from the public on the said draft have been considered by the Central Government.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 8 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby recognises the Indian Standards Institution Certification Mark in relation to P. V. C. Leather cloth for the purpose of denoting that

where P.V.C. leather cloth are affixed or applied with such mark, they shall be deemed to be in conformity with standard specifications applicable thereto, under clause (3) of section 6 of the said Act.

**Explanation**—In this notification “P.V.C. leather cloth” means cloth made of cotton, jute, rayon, nylon or any other synthetic fabric to which a layer of suitably compounded vinyl chloride polymer or copolymer is applied either on one or on both sides by coating or lamination.

[No. 6(42)/72-EI&amp;EP]

C. B. KUKRETI, Joint Director

## मुख्य नियंत्रक आयत नियंत्रित का कार्यालय

## प्रावेश

नई विल्सो, 16 दिसम्बर, 1980

**का०आ० ५२—सर्वश्री उप मुख्य अधिकारी (एम एच पी), प० बंगल, गाज़िय बोर्ड, कलकत्ता को आई०डी०ग० अ० सं० ६०४-प्राई एन के अन्तर्गत प्रयोगशाला परीक्षण उपकरण का आयात करने के लिए डी०ग०म० ८०६५१ के तुल्य ३,७५,३२० रु० (सीन लाख पचहत्तर हजार तीन सौ बीस रुपय मात्र) जो बाद मे घटाकर ३,०६,६५८/- रुपय कर दिए गए थे, के लिए आयात लाइसेंस स० जी०ए०/२०३३८३१/एम/प्राई०/६७/ग०/७८/म० ३००-२००८ दिनांक १२-५-१९७८ प्रवान किया गया था। पार्टी ने उक्त लाइसेंस की सीमा शुल्क एवं मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रति की अनुलिपि प्रति जारी करने के लिए इस धाराधार पर मार्वेदन किया है कि लाइसेंस की मूल सीमा शुल्क एवं मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रति खो गई अथवा अस्थानस्थ हो गई है। आगे यह भी बताया गया है कि लाइसेंस की सीमा शुल्क एवं मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रति किमी भी पन्न प्राधिकारी के पास पंजीकृत नहीं कराई गई थी और इस प्रकार सीमा शुल्क प्रयोगन प्रति बिल्कुल भी उपयोग में नहीं लाई गई है।**

2. अपने तरफ के समर्थन में लाइसेंसधारी ने नोटरी प्रिवेट (क्रम सं० १४५/८० बैकरेल कोर्ट) कलकत्ता के समक्ष विप्रिवेत शपथ में हुए स्टाम्प कागज पर एक शपथ पत्र दाखिल किया है। तशुगार, मै सल्लुट हूँ कि आयात लाइसेंस स० जी०ए०/२०३३८३१, दिनांक १२-५-१९७८ की मूल सीमा शुल्क एवं मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रति लो गई है अथवा अस्थानस्थ हो गई है। पथा संग्रहित आयात (नियंत्रण) आवेदन, १९५५ की उपक्रिया ९ (सी० सी०) के अन्तर्गत प्रदत्त प्राधिकारों का प्रयाग करने हुए सर्वश्री प० बंगल, गाज़िय बोर्ड, कलकत्ता के नाम में जारी किए।

## नागरिक पूर्ति भंगालय

(नागरिक पूर्ति विभाग)

नई विल्सो, 16 दिसम्बर, 1980

सारतीय भालूक संस्था

**का०आ० ५३—**समय-समय पर संग्रहित भारतीय मानक संस्था (प्रमाणन चिक्क) विनियम १९५५ के विनियम १४ के उपविनियम (४) के अनुसार भारतीय मानक संस्था द्वारा अधिकृत किया जाता है कि लाइसेंस मध्या सी०ए०/ए०-७४७३ जिसके ब्यौरे नीचे अनुमती में दिये गये हैं १९७९-०४-०७ से रद्द कर दिया गया है क्योंकि फर्म लाइसेंस जारी रखने की इच्छुक नहीं है।

## प्रत्यक्षी

क्रम	लाइसेंस नंबर	लाइसेंसधारी का नाम और पता	रद्द किये गये लाइसेंस के प्रधीन वस्तु/प्रक्रिया	तत्वधीय भारतीय मानक
संख्या	और तिथि		3	5
1	2	3	3	5
1.	सी०ए०/ए०-७४७३ १९७९-०१-१०	मैमर्स गाल्डा काटीन्यूअ्रम कास्टिङ्स लि० पी २/६ आई०डी०ए० अ०क्ट०क्ट० III उपल्फ हैदराबाद-५०००३९ (प्रान्ध प्रदेश)	समान्य इंजीनियरी कार्यों के लिये एनुमिनियम मिश्र स्टेट मिश्र धातु पतनाम : केवल ४४२०	IS : ६१७—१९७५ सामान्य <sup>१</sup> इंजीनियरी कार्यों के लिये एनुमिनियम और एनुमिनियम मिश्र धातु हैंगट और हली वस्तुओं की विशिष्टि (इसमें पूनरीक्षण)

[स० सी० ए० डी०/५५ : ७४७३]  
ए० पी० बनर्जी, अपर महानिदेशक

गण आयात लाइसेंस स० जी०ए०/२०३३८३१, दिनांक १२-५-७८ की मूल सीमा शुल्क एवं मुद्रा विनियम प्रति पत्रक्षण रद्द की जाती है।

3. पार्टी को अलग से उक्त लाइसेंस की सीमा शुल्क एवं मुद्रा विनियम प्रति प्रति की अनुलिपि प्रति जारी की जा रही है।

[म० सी० जी० २/ए० ई० पी० (डब्ल्यू बी०-२)/७८-७९/१०७२]

जी० ए० ग्रेवल, उप युवराज नियंत्रक आयात-नियंत्रित कृते युवराज नियंत्रक आयात-नियंत्रित

## OFFICE OF THE CHIEF CONTROLLER OF IMPORTS AND EXPORTS

## ORDER

New Delhi, the 16th December, 1980

**S.O. 52—**M/s. The Deputy Chief Engineer (S&P), West Bengal State Electricity Board, Calcutta were granted an Import Licence No. G/H/2033831/S/IA/67/H/78/GII/L.S. dated 12-5-78 for Rs. 3,75,320 which was subsequently reduced to Rs. 3,06,658 (Rupees Three lakhs Six thousand Six hundred and Fifty Eight only) equivalent to DM 80,651 for import of laboratory testing equipment under IDA Credit No. 604-IN. The firm has applied for issue of duplicate copy of Customs as well as Exchange Control Purposes copy of the above mentioned licence on the ground that the original Customs Purposes and Exchange Control Purposes copy of the licence have been lost or misplaced. It has further been stated that the Customs and Exchange Control Purposes copy of the licence were not registered with any Customs authority and as such the value of Customs Purposes copy has not been utilised at all.

2. In support of their contention, the licensee has filed an affidavit on stamped paper duly sworn in before Notary Public (Sl. No. 145/80 Bankshall Court), Calcutta. I am accordingly satisfied that the original Customs and Exchange Control Purposes copy of import licence No. G/H/2033831 dated 12-5-1978 has been lost or misplaced by the firm. In exercise of the powers conferred under sub-clause 9(cc) of the Import (Control) Order, 1955 dated 7-12-1955 as amended the said original Customs and Exchange Control Purposes copy No. G/H/2033831 dated 12-5-1978 issued to M/s. West Bengal State Electricity Board, Calcutta is hereby cancelled.

3. A duplicate Customs and Exchange Control Purposes copy of the said licence is being issued to the party separately.

[No. CGII/HEP(WB-2)/78-79/1072]  
G. S. GREWAL, Dy. Chief Controller  
of Imports and Exports  
for the Controller of Imports Exports

## MINISTRY OF CIVIL SUPPLIES

(Dept. of Civil Supplies)

New Delhi, the 16th December, 1980

## INDIAN STANDARDS INSTITUTION

**S.O. 53 :**—In pursuance of sub-regulation (4) of regulation 14 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks), Regulations 1955 as amended from time to time, the Indian Standards Institution hereby notifies that Licence No. CM/L-7473 particulars of which are given below has been cancelled with effect from 1979-04-07 as the firm is not interested to operate the licence.

## SCHEDULE

S. No.	Licence No. and date	Name & Address of the Licensee	Article/Process Covered by the Licensees Cancelled	Relevant Indian Standards
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1.	CM/L-7473 1979-01-10	M/s Galada Continuous Castings Ltd., P2/6 IDA Block III, Uppal, Hyderabad-500039(AP)	Aluminium alloy ingots for general engineering purposes alloy designation : 4420 only	IS:617-1975 Specification for aluminium and aluminium alloy ingots and castings for general engineering purposes (second revision).

[CMD/55 : 7473]

A. P. BANERJI, Additional Director General

## उद्दीग भंडालय

(भारतीय विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 23 दिसम्बर, 1980

का० आ० 54.—सार्वजनिक परिमर (प्रतिष्ठित दखलकारों को बेंदखला) प्रधिनियम, 1971 (1971 का 40) की धारा 3 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एवं द्वारा निम्न तालिका के कानून (1) में उल्लिखित अधिकारी को, जो सरकार के राजपत्रिका अधिकारी के समकक्ष स्वर का अधिकारी है उसके अधिनियम के प्रयोजनों के लिए मन्त्रालय अधिकारी नियुक्त करती है और यह भी निवेश देती है कि उक्त अधिकारी उक्त तालिका के कानून (2) में विनिर्विष्ट सार्वजनिक परिमरों के सम्बन्ध में प्रयोग अधिकार थोक की सीमाओं के अन्वर उक्त अधिनियम के द्वारा या अन्तर्मित सम्बद्ध अधिकारियों को प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करेगा, और सौंपे गए कर्तव्यों का पालन करेगा :—

## तालिका

अधिकारी का नाम तथा पदनाम	मरकारी परिमरों की थेंगों द्वारा अधिकार थोक की स्थानीय सीमाएँ
--------------------------	--

1

2

श्री के० जे० टक्कर, सचिव तथा प्रशासनिक अधिकारी विवृति संपादक अटलाम (1972) लिमिटेड, (भारत सरकार का उपक्रम) वायकुला आयरन वर्क्स, सर जे० जे० राइ बम्बई-400008	रिचर्डसन एण्ड शुषाम (1972) लिमिटेड, बम्बई के प्रशासनिक नियन्त्रण में भारत में केसी भी जगह स्थित भूमि तथा भवना महिन सार्वजनिक परिमर।
--	---

[का० म० 14(24)/80-ग्राम-4]

प्रेम बहादुर मकसेना, उप मंत्रिय

## MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY

(Department of Heavy Industry)

New Delhi, the 23rd December, 1980

**S.O. 54.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 3 of the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Act, 1971 (40 of 1971), the Central Government hereby appoints the officer mentioned in column (1) of the Table below, being an officer equivalent to the rank of gazetted officers of

Government, to be Estate Officer for the purposes of the said Act and further directs that the said officer shall exercise the powers conferred, and perform the duties imposed, on estate officers by or under, the said Act, within the limits of his jurisdiction in respect of the public premises specified in column (2) of the said Table :

## TABLE

Name & Designation of the Officer	Categories of public premises, and local limits of jurisdiction
(1)	(2)
Shri K. J. Thacker, Secretary and Administrative Officer, Richardson & Cruddas, (1972) Limited (A Goverment of India Undertaking), Byculla Iron Works, Sir. J. J. Road, Bombay-400008.	Public premises including land and buildings under the administrative control of the Richardson and Cruddas (1972) Limited, Bombay, situated anywhere in India.

[F. No. 14(24)/80/HM-IV]  
P. B. SAXENA, Dy. Secy.

## विवेश भंडालय

नई दिल्ली, 17 दिसम्बर, 1980

का० आ० 55.—राजनियक एवं कोमली अधिकारी (ग्राम पंचायत) प्रधिनियम 1948 (1948 का 41 वा) की धारा 2 के छठे (क) के प्रत्युत्तर में केन्द्र सरकार, इसके द्वारा भारत का हाई कमीशन, लापोस नाहजीरिया, में निजी महायक श्री के० सी० भाटिया को तत्काल से कोमली एंजेट का कार्य करने के लिए प्रतिष्ठित करती है।

[काइल स० टी० 4330/1/80]  
जे० ऊरारो, अवर मंत्रिय

## MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

New Delhi, the 17th December, 1980

**S.O. 55.**—In pursuance of the clause (a) of section 2 of the Diplomatic and Consular Officer (Oaths and fees) Act, 1948 (41 of 1948) the Central Government hereby

authorises Shri K. C. Bhatia, Personal Assistant in the High Commission of India, Lagos, Nigeria to perform the duties of a Consular Agent with immediate effect.

[File No. T. 4330/1/80]  
J. HAZARI, Under Secy.

## पेट्रोलियम, रसायन और उर्वरक मंत्रालय

(पेट्रोलियम विभाग)

नई त्रिलोनी, 17 दिसंबर, 1980

का० आ० ५६—पत्. केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहिंसा में यह आशयक है कि उत्तर प्रदेश में मधुरा से जालन्धर (पंजाब) तक पेट्रोलियम पदार्थ के परिवहन के लिए पाइप लाइन इंजिन आयल कार्पोरेशन द्वारा बिलाई जानी चाहिये।

और यह यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाईन का विलाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एक्सप्रेस अनुसूची में विणित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइप लाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962] (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एकदमारा घोषित किया है।

वर्णते कि उक्त भूमि में हिन्दूबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइप लाइन विलाने के लिए आधेप सक्षम प्राधिकारी, इंडियन आयल कार्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, मधुरा—जालन्धर पाइप लाइन प्रोजेक्ट, न्यु हाऊस, कुन्जपुरा मार्ग, करनाल (हरियाणा) को हम अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आधेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिदिष्ट यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत ही या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

### अनुसूची

तहसील : नूह	जिला : गुजरात	राज्य : हरियाणा		
ग्राम का नाम	वस्तरा नं०	शेत्रफल		
		इ०	मि०	बर्बी०
किरंज	21/20 मिन	0	04	51
ह० न० 187	29/7 मिन	0	00	55
	29/14/2 मिन	0	01	26
	29/16 मिन	0	00	51
	29/25/1 मिन	0	08	09
	38/11/1 मिन	0	02	02
	38/11/2 मिन	0	02	53
	45/2 मिन	0	00	51

[स० 12020/20/80 प्र००]

### MINISTRY OF PETROLEUM, CHEMICALS & FERTILIZER

(Department of Petroleum)

New Delhi 17th December, 1980

S.O. 56.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum products from Mathura in Uttar Pradesh to Jullundur in Punjab pipelines should be laid by the Indian Oil Corporation Limited.

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipelines, it is necessary to acquire the Right of User in the land described in the schedule annexed here to ;

Now Therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declare its intention to acquire the right of user therein :

Provided That any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipelines under the land to the Competent Authority, Indian Oil Corporation Limited, Mathura-Jullundur Pipeline, New House, Kunjpura Road, Karnal (Haryana).

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by a legal practitioner.

### SCHEDULE

Tahsil : Nuh Distt : Gurgaon State : Haryana

Name of Village	Khasra No.	Area		
		H.	A.	Sq. M.
Kiranj H. No. 187	21/20 Min.	0	00	51
	29/7 Min.	0	04	55
	29/14/2 Min.	0	01	26
	29/16 Min.	0	00	51
	29/25/1 Min.	0	08	09
	38/11/1 Min.	0	02	02
	38/11/2 Min.	0	02	53
	45/2 Min.	0	00	51

[No. 12020/20/80-Prod]

का० आ० ५७—पत्. केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहिंसा में यह आशयक है कि उत्तर प्रदेश में मधुरा से जालन्धर (पंजाब) तक पेट्रोलियम पदार्थ के परिवहन के लिए पाइप लाइन इंजिन आयल कार्पोरेशन द्वारा बिलाई जानी चाहिये।

और यह : यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाईनों के विलाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एक्सप्रेस अनुसूची में विणित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइप लाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एकदमारा घोषित किया है।

वर्णते कि उक्त भूमि में हिन्दूबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइप लाइन विलाने के लिए आधेप सक्षम प्राधिकारी, इंडियन आयल कार्पोरेशन लिमिटेड, मधुरा—जालन्धर पाइप लाइन प्रोजेक्ट, न्यु हाऊस, कुन्जपुरा मार्ग, करनाल (हरियाणा) को हम अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आधेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिदिष्ट यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत ही या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

अनुसूची			1	2	3	4	5
क्रमांक . पानीपत	जिला . कर्नाल	राज्य हरियाणा	नमोन्दा ह० न० 79	51/24/1 मिन	0	10	12
ग्राम का नाम	खसरा न०	हेक्टर मेरि वर्ग-मीटर		70/4/1 मिन	0	00	51
1	2	3	4	5			
चुलकाना ह० न०	16/19 मिन	0	12	39	70/4/2 मिन	0	08
118	16/22 मिन	0	10	12	70/7/1 मिन	0	02
	42/2 मिन	0	10	12	70/7/2 मिन	0	07
	42/9 मिन	0	09	61	70/8 मिन	0	00
	42/12 मिन	0	10	12	70/13/3 मिन	0	02
	42/19 मिन	0	10	12	70/14/मिन	0	04
	42/22 मिन	0	10	12	70/17 मिन	0	06
	48/2 मिन	0	10	12	70/18/1 मिन	0	04
	18/9 मिन	0	10	12	70/23 मिन	0	05
	48/12 मिन	0	10	12	70/24/1 मिन	0	04
	48/19/2 मिन	0	10	12	74/3/2 मिन	0	09
	48/21/2 मिन	0	00	25	74/4/1 मिन	0	01
	48/22 मिन	0	09	36	74/8 मिन	0	10
	75/1/1/2 मिन	0	00	51	74/13 मिन	0	09
	75/1/1 मिन	0	01	01	74/18 मिन	0	10
	75/2/1 मिन	0	02	53	74/23 मिन	0	10
	75/2/2 मिन	0	01	05	91/3 मिन	0	10
	75/9 मिन	0	06	58	91/8 मिन	0	10
	75/10 मिन	0	02	78	91/18/2 मिन	0	05
	75/11 मिन	0	05	56	91/22/3 मिन	0	00
	75/12 मिन	0	01	55	91/23 मिन	0	09
	75/19 मिन	0	02	28	94/2/1 मिन	0	01
	75/20/1 मिन	0	07	08	94/2/2 मिन	0	00
	75/21/2 मिन	0	10	12	94/3/1 मिन	0	06
	84/1 मिन	0	10	12	94/8 मिन	0	05
	84/10/1 मिन	0	10	12	94/9 मिन	0	05
	84/11 मिन	0	10	12	94/12 मिन	0	06
	84/20/1 मिन	0	02	02	94/13 मिन	0	00
	84/21 मिन	0	02	02	123 मिन	0	03
	111/1 मिन	0	10	12	143 मिन	0	00
	111/10/2 मिन	0	10	12	290 मिन	0	00
	111/11 मिन	0	10	12	291 मिन	0	00
	111/20 मिन	0	10	12	292 मिन	0	01
	111/21 मिन	0	10	12	293 मिन	0	01
	113/5 मिन	0	00	25	295 मिन	0	00
	113/6 मिन	0	01	52	332 मिन	0	00
	114/1 मिन	0	09	61	19/25 मिन	0	01
	114/10 मिन	0	07	33	20/5 मिन	0	10
	114/195 मिन	0	02	02	20/6 मिन	0	09
	114/223 मिन	0	00	51	20/15/1 मिन	0	10
	114/224 मिन	0	00	51	20/16 मिन	0	09
	114/225 मिन	0	00	51	24/24/3 मिन	0	00
	114/260 मिन	0	00	76	24/25 मिन	0	09
	114/329 मिन	0	00	51	39/4 मिन	0	02
नमोन्दा ह०न० 79	51/4 मिन	0	05	06	39/5 मिन	0	08
	51/7/1 मिन	0	08	09	39/6 मिन	0	05
	51/7/2 मिन	0	02	02	39/7 मिन	0	04
	51/14 मिन	0	10	12	39/14 मिन	0	08
	51/17/1 मिन	0	06	07	39/15 मिन	0	02
	51/17/2 मिन	0	04	05	3916 मिन	0	00

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
किंचना ह० न० 78	39/17/2 मिन	0	09	11	ठोड़पुर ह० न० 75	59/25/1 मिन	0	05	82
	39/24 मिन	0	09	36		59/25/2 मिन	0	02	02
	41/4 मिन	0	09	61		77 मिन	0	02	28
	41/7/1 मिन	0	03	51		79 मिन	0	02	28
	41/7/2 मिन	0	06	54		108 मिन	0	00	51
	41/14 मिन	0	04	30		109 मिन	0	06	58
	41/17 मिन	0	12	39		254 मिन	0	00	76
	41/24/1 मिन	0	10	12		269 मिन	0	00	76
	64/4/1 मिन	0	05	06					
	119 मिन	0	03	24	मनाना ह० न० 76	41/3/1 मिन	0	01	01
	267 मिन	0	00	51		41/8 मिन	0	08	60
	268 मिन	0	00	51		41/13 मिन	0	10	12
	269 मिन	0	00	51		41/18 मिन	0	10	12
	669 मिन	0	00	76		41/23 मिन	0	10	12
	671 मिन	0	01	52		42/3 मिन	0	10	12
ठोड़पुर ह०न० 75	23/10 मिन	0	04	81		42/8 मिन	0	10	12
	23/12 मिन	0	10	12		42/13/1 मिन	0	07	08
	23/19 मिन	0	09	11		42/13/2 मिन	0	03	04
	23/20 मिन	0	00	76		42/18 मिन	0	10	12
	23/21 मिन	0	03	04		42/23 मिन	0	10	12
	23/22 मिन	0	07	08		62/3/2 मिन	0	10	12
	25/1 मिन	0	05	~6		62/8 मिन	0	10	12
	25/2 मिन	0	04	55		62/13 मिन	0	09	11
	25/9 मिन	0	01	52		62/18 मिन	0	08	60
	25/10/1 मिन	0	06	07		62/23 मिन	0	10	12
	25/10/2 मिन	0	02	53		63/3 मिन	0	10	12
	25/11/1 मिन	0	00	76		63/8 मिन	0	10	12
	25/11/2 मिन	0	05	06		63/13 मिन	0	10	12
	25/11/3 मिन	0	03	79		63/18 मिन	0	10	12
	25/12 मिन	0	00	25		63/23 मिन	0	10	12
	25/20 मिन	0	09	36		87/3 मिन	0	10	12
	25/21 मिन	0	10	12		87/8/2 मिन	0	09	36
	42/1 मिन	0	09	61		87/12/2 मिन	0	00	25
	42/10 मिन	0	07	94		87/13 मिन	0	04	61
	42/11 मिन	0	10	12		87/18 मिन	0	07	08
	42/20 मिन	0	10	12		87/19/1 मिन	0	03	04
	42/21 मिन	0	10	12		87/22 मिन	0	04	91
	46/1 मिन	0	09	61		87/23 मिन	0	04	81
	46/10 मिन	0	10	12		90/2/2 मिन	0	07	59
	46/11 मिन	0	10	12		90/3 मिन	0	02	53
	46/20 मिन	0	08	09		90/8/2 मिन	0	00	51
	46/21 मिन	0	05	06		90/9/1 मिन	0	08	09
	47/16 मिन	0	01	01		90/9/2 मिन	0	02	02
	47/25 मिन	0	03	04		90/12 मिन	0	10	12
	56/5 मिन	0	04	55		90/19 मिन	0	10	12
	56/6 मिन	0	07	08		90/22 मिन	0	10	12
	56/15 मिन	0	09	11		114/2 मिन	0	09	36
	56/16 मिन	0	12	65		114/9 मिन	0	10	12
	56/25 मिन	0	05	31		114/12/1 मिन	0	08	09
	57/1 मिन	0	02	78		114/12/2 मिन	0	02	02
	57/10 मिन	0	01	01		114/19 मिन	0	10	12
	59/5 मिन	0	10	12		114/22/1 मिन	0	00	76
	59/6 मिन	0	10	12		114/22/2 मिन	0	09	11
	59/15 मिन	0	10	12		117/2 मिन	0	10	12
	59/16/1 मिन	0	10	12		117/9 मिन	0	05	31

1	2	3	1	2	1	2	3	4	5
मनाना ह० न० 76	117/175 मिन	0	02	53	पहलादपुर खलीला	121 मिन	0	08	85
	117/264 मिन	0	00	51	ह० न० 34	131 मिन	0	10	12
	117/702 मिन	0	00	76		227 मिन	0	01	26
	117/703 मिन	0	00	76		230 मिन	0	06	32
नारायणा ह० न० 74	20/10 मिन	0	04	55		231 मिन	0	08	95
	20/11 मिन मिन	0	09	61		272 मिन	0	08	85
	20/12 मिन	0	00	51		273 मिन	0	09	85
	20/19/2 मिन	0	02	02		282 मिन	0	08	85
	20/20 मिन	0	07	59		283 मिन	0	08	85
	20/21/1 मिन	0	00	76		290 मिन	0	08	85
	20/21/2 मिन	0	01	77		308 मिन	0	08	95
	20/22 मिन	0	05	06		309 मिन	0	08	95
	22/1/2 मिन	0	04	05		313 मिन	0	11	13
	22/2 मिन	0	07	08	बरणाम ह० न० 35	2340 मिन	0	04	55
	22/9 मिन	0	02	78		2341 मिन	0	00	76
	22/12 मिन	0	12	65		2343 मिन	0	10	12
	22/19/2 मिन	0	10	12		2345 मिन	0	02	53
	22/22 मिन	0	10	12		2346 मिन	0	03	79
	41/2 मिन	0	09	61		2347 मिन	0	02	53
	41/9 मिन	0	10	12		2349 मिन	0	07	59
	41/12 मिन	0	10	12		2350 मिन	0	00	76
	41/19 मिन	0	10	12		2360 मिन	0	08	85
	41/22 मिन	0	10	12		2378 मिन	0	08	85
	44/2 मिन	0	10	12		2383 मिन	0	08	85
	44/9 मिन	0	10	12		2384 मिन	0	05	06
	44/12/2 मिन	0	10	12		2385 मिन	0	03	79
	44/19 मिन	0	09	36		2388 मिन	0	08	45
	44/22 मिन	0	10	12		2389 मिन	0	00	51
	65/2/1 मिन	0	03	29		2391 छ्ल	0	08	85
	65/2/2 मिन	0	05	82		2504 मिन	0	08	85
	65/3 मिन	0	01	01		2505 मिन	0	06	83
	65/8 मिन	0	03	04		2511 मिन	0	00	76
	65/9 मिन	0	06	58		2518 मिन	0	08	85
	65/12 मिन	0	04	55		2520 मिन	0	08	85
	65/13 मिन	0	05	56		2521 मिन	0	08	09
	65/18 मिन	0	06	58		2524 मिन	0	02	02
	65/19 मिन	0	03	54		2576 मिन	0	00	51
	65/22 मिन	0	02	53		2577 मिन	0	08	35
	65/23/1 मिन	0	06	07		2578 मिन	0	03	04
	65/23/2 मिन	0	01	52		2579 मिन	0	05	82
	66/2 मिन	0	01	01		2582 मिन	0	04	85
	66/3 मिन	0	08	35		2585 मिन	0	08	85
	66/9 मिन	0	01	26		2588 मिन	0	08	85
	166 मिन	0	02	28		2603 मिन	0	00	51
	210 मिन	0	00	51		2794 मिन	0	00	51
	222 मिन	0	00	51		2797 मिन	0	05	82
	587 मिन	0	00	76		2798 मिन	0	03	04
	603 मिन	0	00	76		2805 मिन	0	08	35
पहलादपुर खलीला	101 मिन	0	03	04		2806 मिन	0	08	85
ह० न० 34	106 मिन	0	04	30		2812 मिन	0	08	85
	107 मिन	0	02	02		2813 मिन	0	08	35
	108 मिन	0	07	08		2814 मिन	0	00	51
	114 मिन	0	08	35		2817 मिन	0	05	82
	115 मिन	0	00	76		2818 मिन	0	03	29
	119 मिन	0	08	85		2825 मिन	0	05	56

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
बरशम ह० न० 35	2826 मिन	0	03	29	हरलाली	5/14 मिन	0	03	35
	2827 मिन	0	08	35	ह०न० 36	5/17/1 मिन	0	01	52
	2834 मिन	0	04	55		5/17/2 मिन	0	08	60
	2835 मिन	0	00	51		5/24 मिन	0	10	13
दीवाना ह० न० 33	8/22/1 मिन	0	05	31		5/26 मिन	0	02	02
	10/1 मिन	0	01	77		14/4/2 मिन	0	01	26
	10/2 मिन	0	08	09		14/14 मिन	0	02	53
	10/9 मिन	0	10	37		14/16 मिन	0	03	54
	10/12 मिन	0	09	86		14/17 मिन	0	06	58
	10/19/1 मिन	0	02	02		14/24 मिन	0	00	51
	10/19/2 मिन	0	08	35		14/25 मिन	0	09	61
	10/22 मिन	0	09	36		16/21 मिन	0	02	02
	10/23 मिन	0	01	01		17/5 मिन	0	10	12
	26/2 मिन	0	02	78		17/6 मिन	0	10	12
	26/3 मिन	0	07	84		17/15 मिन	0	10	37
	26/8 मिन	0	10	37		17/16 मिन	0	10	37
	26/13 मिन	0	08	09		17/25 मिन	0	06	32
	26/18 मिन	0	09	61		30/5 मिन	0	00	25
	26/23 मिन	0	09	86		31/1/1 मिन	0	01	52
	26/24 मिन	0	00	25		31/20 मिन	0	10	37
	26/26 मिन	0	02	02		31/21 मिन	0	06	07
	30/3 मिन	0	05	31		31/110 मिन	0	06	32
	30/4 मिन	0	05	31		31/131 मिन	0	05	56
	30/7 मिन	0	09	36	सिवाह	113/13 मिन	0	04	81
	30/14 मिन	0	10	37	ह०न० 32	18/2 मिन	0	03	29
	30/17/1 मिन	0	00	76		113/19/1 मिन	0	07	08
	30/17/2 मिन	0	09	61		113/22/2 मिन	0	00	78
	30/24 मिन	0	10	37		113/23 मिन	0	09	61
	47/4/1 मिन	0	01	52		114/3 मिन	0	09	86
	17/4/2 मिन	0	05	56		114/8 मिन	0	09	86
	47/5 मिन	0	03	54		114/13 मिन	0	11	83
	47/6 मिन	0	09	36		114/18 मिन	0	05	56
	47/7 मिन	0	00	76		114/24 मिन	0	06	07
	47/7/2 मिन	0	00	00		146/4 मिन	0	07	33
	47/15 मिन	0	09	61		146/7 मिन	0	10	37
	47/16 मिन	0	10	37		146/15 मिन	0	04	81
	47/25 मिन	0	10	37		209 मिन	0	01	26
	50/5 मिन	0	09	61	मेहराजा	2/24 मिन	0	10	37
	50/6 मिन	0	03	04	ह०न० 29	6/4 मिन	0	10	37
	51/1 मिन	0	00	76		5/5 मिन	0	00	25
	51/10 मिन	0	07	33		5/7 मिन	0	06	32
	51/11 मिन	0	10	37		17/2/2 मिन	0	05	31
	51/20 मिन	0	10	37		17/8 मिन	0	03	04
	51/21 मिन	0	03	04		17/9 मिन	0	07	33
	94 मिन	0	01	01		17/12 मिन	0	00	25
	117 मिन	0	00	51		17/13 मिन	0	10	12
	118 मिन	0	00	51		17/18 मिन	0	10	37
	124 मिन	0	00	51		17/23 मिन	0	10	37
	218 मिन	0	00	76		25/3 मिन	0	10	37
	224 मिन	0	00	76		25/7 मिन	0	09	36
हरलाली ह०न० 36	4/23 मिन	0	01	26		25/14 मिन	0	02	02
	5/3/2 मिन	0	07	84		31/12 मिन	0	05	31
	5/4 मिन	0	01	77		31/19/1 मिन	0	05	31
	5/7 मिन	0	08	09		31/19/2 मिन	0	05	31
	5/8 मिन	0	02	02		31/22 मिन	0	10	62

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
महेश्वरा	44/2 मिन	0	06	07	पानीपत तरफ राजपूतान	827 मिन	0	00	51
ह०न० 29	44/3 मिन	0	04	05	ह०न० 16	831 मिन	0	00	00
	44/8 मिन	0	10	12		832 मिन	0	04	55
	44/9 मिन	0	00	25		836 मिन	0	00	76
	44/13/1 मिन	0	03	54		869/2/2 मिन	0	00	76
	44/13/2 मिन	0	05	06		872 मिन	0	05	57
	44/18/2 मिन	0	10	37		873/2 मिन	0	08	35
	44/23 मिन	0	10	37		874 मिन	0	10	12
	49/3 मिन	0	05	06		877 मिन	0	00	76
	49/4/1 मिन	0	02	53		886 मिन	0	08	85
	49/4/2 मिन	0	02	78		887 मिन	0	01	77
	49/7/1 मिन	0	02	28		888 मिन	0	07	08
	49/7/2 मिन	0	08	09		889 मिन	0	05	06
	49/14 मिन	0	10	37		890 मिन	0	11	89
	49/17 मिन	0	10	37		891 मिन	0	01	77
	49/24 मिन	0	08	60		892 मिन	0	07	84
	49/25 मिन	0	01	77		893/1 मिन	0	00	51
	62/4 मिन	0	01	01		991 मिन	0	03	79
	62/5 मिन	0	09	35		992 मिन	0	03	79
	62/6 मिन	0	18	36		995 मिन	0	06	32
	62/15 मिन	0	10	37		996 मिन	0	08	10
	62/16 मिन	0	09	86		1012 मिन	0	01	26
	62/25/2 मिन	0	02	78		1016 मिन	0	08	35
	62/26 मिन	0	00	51		1018 मिन	0	06	32
	62/21 मिन	0	07	84		1021 मिन	0	05	57
	65/1 मिन	0	09	86		1022 मिन	0	04	05
	65/10 मिन	0	10	37		1023 मिन	0	01	77
	15/11 मिन	0	09	86		1122 मिन	0	01	26
	65/19 मिन	0	03	29		4155/1123/1 मिन	0	01	77
	15/20/2 मिन	0	04	81		4157/1125 मिन	0	00	76
	65/21 मिन	0	00	00		1136 मिन	0	07	08
	65/22 मिन	0	09	86		1137 मिन	0	02	53
	77/2/1 मिन	0	08	35		1149 मिन	0	02	53
	77/2/2 मिन	0	01	52		1151 मिन	0	11	89
	77/9 मिन	0	10	37		1156 मिन	0	15	18
	77/12 मिन	0	05	56		1475/2 मिन	0	00	76
	106 मिन	0	01	77		1496 मिन	0	00	51
	186 मिन	0	03	54		1497/1 मिन	0	00	76
पानीपत तरफ राजपूतान	693 मिन	0	06	83		1497/2 मिन	0	01	26
ह०न० 16	694 मिन	0	01	77		1497/3 मिन	0	06	58
	695 मिन	0	00	00		1498 मिन	0	01	77
	698 मिन	0	00	76		1499 मिन	0	01	26
	698/1 मिन	0	01	26		1500 मिन	0	00	51
	810 मिन	0	09	61		1503 मिन	0	12	65
	811 मिन	0	01	77		1504 मिन	0	13	91
	812 मिन	0	05	06		1508 मिन	0	12	65
	813 मिन	0	00	00		1519 मिन	0	01	77
	815 मिन	0	04	55		1520 मिन	0	00	00
	816 मिन	0	00	51		1524 मिन	0	07	36
	821 मिन	0	03	29		1525 मिन	0	03	79
	822 मिन	0	08	85		1528 मिन	0	01	77
	823 मिन	0	00	76		1529 मिन	0	07	08
	824 मिन	0	08	10		1532 मिन	0	01	77
	825 मिन	0	00	51					

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
पार्नीपत्र तराक राजपूतान	1537 मिन	0	01	26	पार्नीपत्र तराक राजपूतान	3965/1986 मिन	0	09	11
ह०न० 16	1538 मिन	0	12	65	ह०न० 16	1988 मिन	0	07	08
	1539 मिन	0	15	18		1989 मिन	0	03	79
	1540 मिन	0	00	76		1979 मिन	0	03	94
	1543 मिन	0	00	76		1998 मिन	0	01	77
	1545 मिन	0	06	07		1999 मिन	0	00	51
	1552 मिन	0	08	10		2011 मिन	0	07	08
	1553 मिन	0	05	06		2012 मिन	0	04	55
	1558 मिन	0	02	02		2017 मिन	0	01	77
	1560 मिन	0	02	02		2041 मिन	0	02	53
	1561 मिन	0	10	88	सोधायुर	18/11 मिन	0	02	78
	1562 मिन	0	00	76	ह०न० 26	18/9 मिन	0	05	31
	1563 मिन	0	03	29		19/10/2 मिन	0	01	77
	1564 मिन	0	02	02		19/12 मिन	0	10	37
	1572 मिन	0	06	32		19/19 मिन	0	10	37
	1573 मिन	0	10	63		19/22/1 मिन	0	07	33
	1574 मिन	0	02	02		19/22/2 मिन	0	03	04
	1575 मिन	0	03	04		32/2 मिन	0	10	37
	1576 मिन	0	03	71		32/8 मिन	0	03	04
	1577 मिन	0	00	51		32/9 मिन	0	07	33
	1844 मिन	0	00	51		32/12 मिन	0	01	01
	1847 मिन	0	02	02		32/13 मिन	0	09	36
	1848 मिन	0	09	36		32/18 मिन	0	10	37
	1859 मिन	0	04	55		32/23 मिन	0	09	36
	1860 मिन	0	13	66					
	1861 मिन	0	00	00	पार्नीपत्र तराक हन्मार	1735 मिन	0	00	00
	1864 मिन	0	01	77	ह०न० 12	1744 मिन	0	03	04
	1865 मिन	0	10	12		5612/1745 मिन	0	04	30
	1866 मिन	0	06	83		5613/1746 मिन	0	07	08
	1867 मिन	0	00	00		1747/1 मिन	0	10	63
	1910 मिन	0	08	35		1747/2 मिन	0	00	76
	1911 मिन	0	01	26		2346 मिन	0	00	76
	1917 मिन	0	04	55		2347 मिन	0	02	53
	1918 मिन	0	05	57		2357 मिन	0	00	51
	1920 मिन	0	00	76		2358 मिन	0	07	59
	1923 मिन	0	02	02		2360 मिन	0	10	12
	1924 मिन	0	05	82		5724/2361 मिन	0	01	26
	1930 मिन	0	03	29		2362 मिन	0	13	91
	1931 मिन	0	00	51		2363 मिन	0	07	59
	1932 मिन	0	08	85		2364 मिन	0	00	51
	1933 मिन	0	01	26		2365 मिन	0	09	11
	1948 मिन	0	05	82		2366 मिन	0	07	59
	1948 मिन	0	05	57		2368 मिन	0	00	00
	1949/2 मिन	0	10	12		2369 मिन	0	02	02
	1950 मिन	0	00	51		2370 मिन	0	07	08
	1953/1 मिन	0	01	77		2371 मिन	0	08	35
	1969 मिन	0	00	51		2372 मिन	0	10	88
	1970 मिन	0	05	82		2373 मिन	0	02	53
	1971 मिन	0	00	51		2374 मिन	0	00	51
	1972 मिन	0	02	02		2375 मिन	0	02	02
	1974 मिन	0	15	43		2376 मिन	0	01	26
	1975 मिन	0	01	77		2378 मिन	0	02	53
	1976 मिन	0	03	04		2379 मिन	0	05	57
	1977 मिन	0	02	53		2381 मिन	0	01	26
	1978 मिन	0	02	53		2382 मिन	0	04	30
	1979 मिन	0	00	51		2385 मिन	0	00	51

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
पानीपत तेलंगाना इन्सार ह०न० 12	3087 मिन	0	07	08	काशी	82/22 मिन	0	10	12
	3098 मिन	0	11	14	ह०न० 19	89/2 मिन	0	10	12
	3094 मिन	0	00	00		89/9 मिन	0	10	12
	3095 मिन	0	08	10		89/12 मिन	0	10	12
	3096 मिन	0	10	12		89/19 मिन	0	09	36
	3097 मिन	0	00	00		89/22 मिन	0	05	82
	3101 मिन	0	09	61		96/26 मिन	0	11	89
	3102 मिन	0	15	18		116 मिन	0	01	52
	3104 मिन	0	01	77		149 मिन	0	00	51
	3107 मिन	0	10	88		154 मिन	0	00	51
	3109 मिन	0	00	51		163 मिन	0	00	76
	3110 मिन	0	02	53		164 मिन	0	00	51
	3111/2 मिन	0	03	55		726 मिन	0	00	76
	3146 मिन	0	01	77		731 मिन	0	00	76
सिक्किमपुर ह०न० 19	29/22 मिन	0	08	35		732 मिन	0	00	76
	44/2 मिन	0	03	54		736 मिन	0	00	76
	44/9 मिन	0	01	01	रत्नपुर	12/9 मिन	0	07	33
	58/9 मिन	0	06	07	ह०न० 16	12/12 मिन	0	10	12
	58/12 मिन	0	10	12		12/19 मिन	0	10	12
	58/19 मिन	0	07	54		12/22 मिन	0	09	61
	58/20 मिन	0	02	53		21/2 मिन	0	10	12
	58/21 मिन	0	05	06		21/9 मिन	0	10	12
	58/22/1 मिन	0	04	05		21/12 मिन	0	10	12
	59/1 मिन	0	09	61		21/19 मिन	0	10	12
	59/2 मिन	0	00	51		21/22 मिन	0	10	12
	59/10 मिन	0	08	85		29/2 मिन	0	10	12
	59/299 मिन	0	00	76		29/9 मिन	0	10	12
काशी	26/12 मिन	0	02	02		29/12/1 मिन	0	09	36
ह०न० 18	26/19 मिन	0	10	12		29/19 मिन	0	10	12
	26/22 मिन	0	10	12		29/22 मिन	0	09	11
	29/2 मिन	0	10	12		29/26 मिन	0	00	76
	29/9 मिन	0	10	12		37/2 मिन	0	10	12
	29/12 मिन	0	09	39		37/9 मिन	0	10	12
	29/19 मिन	0	10	12		37/12 मिन	0	07	59
	29/22 मिन	0	10	12		42/2 मिन	0	01	01
	42/2/1 मिन	0	09	61		48 मिन	0	00	51
	42/9 मिन	0	09	36	मुहम्मदपुर	18/1 मिन	0	05	56
	42/12 मिन	0	10	12	ह०न० 15	18/10 मिन	0	10	12
	42/19 मिन	0	10	12		18/11 मिन	0	10	12
	42/22 मिन	0	10	12		18/20 मिन	0	10	12
	57/2 मिन	0	09	61		18/21 मिन	0	10	12
	57/9/2 मिन	0	10	12		23/1 मिन	0	10	12
	57/12 मिन	0	09	36		23/10 मिन	0	10	12
	57/19 मिन	0	10	12		23/11 मिन	0	10	12
	57/22 मिन	0	08	60		23/20 मिन	0	04	05
	68/2 मिन	0	09	61		50 मिन	0	01	52
	68/9 मिन	0	10	12		609 मिन	0	08	09
	68/12/1 मिन	0	02	53		610 मिन	0	07	84
	68/12/2 मिन	0	07	59		612/1 मिन	0	08	85
	68/19 मिन	0	08	09		612/2 मिन	0	00	51
	68/22 मिन	0	03	54		954/619 मिन	0	03	04
	82/2 मिन	0	06	58		620 मिन	0	05	06
	82/9 मिन	0	09	11		621 मिन	0	00	51
	82/12 मिन	0	10	12		622 मिन	0	08	85
	82/19 मिन	0	10	12		625 मिन	0	01	52

					SCHEDULE				
1	2	3	4	5	Tahsil : Panipat	District : Karnal	State : Haryana		
					Name of Village	Khasra No.	Area		
							H.	A.	Sq. M.
मुहमदपुर	627/2 मिन	0	08	35					
इन० 15	629 मिन	0	01	77					
	630 मिन	0	01	52					
	631 मिन	0	01	77					
	668 मिन	0	01	52					
	671/2 मिन	0	03	01					
कछरोली	3/20 मिन	0	01	01					
इन० 1	3/21 मिन	0	10	12					
	11/1 मिन	0	10	12					
	11/10 मिन	0	10	12					
	11/11 मिन	0	10	12					
	11/20 मिन	0	10	12					
	11/21/1 मिन	0	00	76					
	11/21/2 मिन	0	07	84					
	गामता बिना इमरा न०	0	10	77					
	13/1 मिन	0	10	12					
	13/10 मिन	0	10	12					
	13/11 मिन	0	10	12					
	13/20 मिन	0	10	12					
	13/21 मिन	0	10	12					
	24/1 मिन	0	10	12					
	24/10 मिन	0	10	12					
	24/11 मिन	0	10	12					
	24/20 मिन	0	10	12					
	24/21 मिन	0	10	12					
	35/1 मिन	0	10	12					
	35/10 मिन	0	10	12					
	35/11 मिन	0	10	12					
	35/20 मिन	0	10	12	Chullkana H. No. 118	84/21 Min	0	02	02
	35/21 मिन	0	10	12		111/1 Min	0	10	12
	41/1 मिन	0	04	55		111/10/2 Min	0	10	12
						111/11 Min	0	10	12
						111/20 Min	0	10	12
						111/21 Min	0	10	12
						113/5 Min	0	00	25
						113/6 Min	0	01	52
						114/1 Min	0	09	61
						114/10 Min	0	07	33
						195 Min	0	02	02
						223 Min	0	00	51
						224 Min	0	00	51
						225 Min	0	0p	51
						260 Min	0	00	76
						329 Min	0	00	51

[स. 12020/19/80-त्रौ०]

किरन चड्ढा, प्रधार सचिव

**S. O. 57.**—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum products from Mathura in Uttar Pradesh to Jullundur in Punjab pipelines should be laid by the Indian Oil Corporation Limited.

And Whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipelines, it is necessary to acquire the Right of User in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-Section (1) of section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declare its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Provided That any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipelines under the land to the Competent Authority, Indian Oil Corporation Limited, Mathura-Jullundur Pipeline New House, Kunjpura Road, Karnal (Haryana).

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by legal practitioner.

Namouda H. No. 79	51/4 Min	0	05	06
	51/7/1 Min	0	08	09
	51/7/2 Min	0	02	02
	51/14 Min	0	10	12
	51/17/1 Min	0	06	07
	51/17/2 Min	0	04	05
	51/24/1 Min	0	10	12
	70/4/1 Min	0	00	51
	70/4/2 Min	0	08	60
	70/7/1 Min	0	02	53
	70/7/2 Min	0	07	08
	70/8 Min	0	00	51
	70/13/3 Min	0	02	53
	70/14 Min	0	04	30
	70/17 Min	0	06	07

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Namonda H. No. 79	70/18/1 Min	0	04	05	Dhodpur H. No. 75	23/21 Min	0	03	04
	70/23 Min	0	05	31		23/22 Min	0	07	08
	70/24/1 Min	0	04	30		25/1 Min	0	05	56
	74/3/2 Min	0	09	11		25/2 Min	0	04	55
	74/4/1 Min	0	01	01		25/9 Min	0	01	52
	74/8 Min	0	10	12		25/10/1 Min	0	06	07
	74/13 Min	0	09	36		25/10/2 Min	0	02	53
	74/18 Min	0	10	12		25/11/1 Min	0	00	76
	74/23 Min	0	10	12		25/11/2 Min	0	05	06
	91/3 Min	0	10	12		25/11/3 Min	0	03	79
	91/8 Min	0	10	12		25/12 Min	0	00	25
	91/13 Min	0	10	12		25/20 Min	0	09	36
	91/18/1 Min	0	04	30		25/21 Min	0	10	12
	91/18/2 Min	0	05	82		42/1 Min	0	09	61
	91/22/3 Min	0	00	25		42/10 Min	0	07	84
	91/23 Min	0	09	61		42/11 Min	0	10	12
	94/2/1 Min	0	01	26		42/20 Min	0	10	12
	94/2/2 Min	0	00	25		42/21 Min	0	10	12
	94/3/1 Min	0	06	32		46/1 Min	0	09	61
	94/8 Min	0	05	06		46/10 Min	0	10	12
	94/9 Min	0	05	06		46/11 Min	0	10	12
	94/12 Min	0	06	32		46/20 Min	0	08	09
	94/13 Min	0	00	76		46/21 Min	0	05	06
	123 Min	0	03	04		47/16 Min	0	01	01
	143 Min	0	00	51		47/25 Min	0	03	04
	290 Min	0	00	76		56/5 Min	0	04	55
	291 Min	0	00	76		56/6 Min	0	07	08
	292 Min	0	01	77		56/15 Min	0	09	11
	293 Min	0	01	52		56/16 Min	0	12	65
	295 Min	0	00	76		56/25 Min	0	05	31
	332 Min	0	00	25	Dhodbur H. No. 75	57/1 Min	0	02	78
Kiwana H. No. 78	19/25 Min	0	01	77		57/10 Min	0	01	01
	20/5 Min	0	10	12		59/5 Min	0	10	12
	20/6 Min	0	09	36		59/6 Min	0	10	12
	20/15/1 Min	0	10	12		59/15 Min	7	10	12
	20/16 Min	0	09	61		59/16/1 Min	0	10	12
	20/24/3 Min	0	00	25		59/25/1 Min	0	05	82
	20/25 Min	0	09	61		59/25/2 Min	0	02	02
	39/4 Min	0	02	02		77 Min	0	02	28
	39/5 Min	0	08	09		78 Min	0	02	28
	39/6 Min	0	05	06		108 Min	0	00	51
	39/7 Min	0	04	55		109 Min	0	06	58
	39/14 Min	0	08	09		254 Min	0	00	76
	39/15 Min	0	02	02		269 Min	0	00	76
	39/16 Min	0	00	00	Manana H. No. 76	41/3/1 Min	0	01	01
	39/17/1 Min	0	01	01		41/8 Min	0	08	60
	39/17/2 Min	0	09	11		41/13 Min	0	10	12
	39/24 Min	0	09	36		41/18 Min	0	10	12
	41/4 Min	0	09	61		41/23 Min	0	10	12
	41/7/1 Min	0	03	54		42/3 Min	0	10	12
	41/7/2 Min	0	06	58		42/8 Min	0	10	12
	41/14 Min	0	04	30		42/13/1 Min	0	07	08
	41/17 Min	0	12	39		42/13/2 Min	0	03	04
	41/24/1 Min	0	10	12		42/18 Min	0	10	12
	64/4/1 Min	0	05	06		42/23 Min	0	10	12
	119 Min	0	03	29		62/3/2 Min	0	10	12
	267 Min	0	00	51		62/8 Min	0	10	12
	268 Min	0	00	51		62/13 Min	0	09	11
	269 Min	0	00	51		62/18 Min	0	08	60
	669 Min	0	00	76		62/23 Min	0	10	12
	671 Min	0	01	52	Manana H. No. 76	63/3 Min	0	10	12
Dhodpur H. No. 75	23/10 Min	0	04	81		63/8 Min	0	10	12
	23/12 Min	0	10	12		63/13 Min	0	10	12
	23/17 Min	0	09	11		63/18 Min	0	10	12
	23/20 Min	0	00	76		63/23 Min	0	10	12

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Manana H. No. 76	87/3 Min	0	10	12	Naraina H. No. 74	65/12 Min	0	04	55
	87/8/2 Min	0	09	36		65/13 Min	0	05	56
	87/12/2 Min	0	00	25		65/18 Min	0	06	58
	87/13 Min	0	09	61		65/19 Min	0	03	54
	87/18 Min	0	07	08		65/22 Min	0	02	53
	87/19/1 Min	0	03	04		65/23/1 Min	0	06	07
	87/22 Min	0	04	81		65/23/2 Min	0	01	52
	87/23 Min	0	04	81		66/2 Min	0	01	01
	90/2/2 Min	0	07	59		66/3 Min	0	08	35
	90/23 Min	0	04	81		66/9 Min	0	01	26
	90/2/2 Min	0	07	50		166 Min	0	02	28
	90/3 Min	0	02	53		210 Min	0	00	51
	90/8/2 Min	0	00	51		222 Min	0	00	51
	90/9/1 Min	0	08	09		587 Min	0	00	76
	90/9/2 Min	0	02	02		603 Min	0	00	76
	90/12 Min	0	10	12	Pahadpur Khahila	101 Min	0	03	04
	90/19 Min	0	10	12	H. No. 34	106 Min	0	04	30
	90/22 Min	0	10	12		107 Min	0	02	02
	114/2 Min	0	09	36		108 Min	0	07	08
	114/9 Min	0	10	12		114 Min	0	08	35
	114/12/1 Min	0	08	09		115 Min	0	00	76
	114/12/2 Min	0	02	02		119 Min	0	08	85
	114/19 Min	0	10	12		124 Min	0	08	85
	114/22/1 Min	0	00	76		131 Min	0	10	12
	114/22/2 Min	0	09	11		227 Min	0	01	26
	117/2 Min	0	10	12		230 Min	0	06	32
	117/9 Min	0	05	31		231 Min	0	08	85
	175 Min	0	02	53		272 Min	0	08	85
	264 Min	0	00	51		273 Min	0	08	85
	702 Min	0	00	76		282 Min	0	08	85
	703 Min	0	00	76		283 Min	0	08	85
						290 Min	0	08	85
						308 Min	0	08	85
						309 Min	0	08	85
						313 Min	0	11	13
Naraina H. No. 74	20/10 Min	0	04	55	Bursham H. No. 35	2340 Min	0	04	55
	20/11 Min	0	09	61		3241 Min	0	00	76
	20/12 Min	0	00	51		2343 Min	0	10	12
	20/19/2 Min	0	02	02		2345 Min	0	02	53
	20/20 Min	0	07	59		2346 Min	0	03	79
	20/21/1 Min	0	00	76		2347 Min	0	02	53
	20/21/2 Min	0	01	77		2349 Min	0	07	59
	20/22 Min	0	05	06		2350 Min	0	00	76
	22/1/2 Min	0	04	05		2360 Min	0	08	85
	22/2 Min	0	07	08		2378 Min	0	08	85
	22/1/2 Min	0	04	05		2383 Min	0	08	85
	22/2 Min	0	07	08		2384 Min	0	05	06
	22/9 Min	0	02	78		2385 Min	0	03	79
	22/12 Min	0	12	65		2388 Min	0	08	85
	22/19/2 Min	0	10	12		2389 Min	0	00	51
	22/22 Min	0	10	12		2391 Min	0	08	85
	41/2 Min	0	09	61		2504 Min	0	08	85
	41/9 Min	0	10	12		2505 Min	0	06	83
	41/12 Min	0	10	12		2511 Min	0	00	76
	41/19 Min	0	10	12		2518 Min	0	08	85
	41/22 Min	0	10	12		2520 Min	0	08	85
	44/2 Min	0	10	12		2521 Min	0	08	09
	44/9 Min	0	10	12		2524 Min	0	02	02
	44/12/2 Min	0	10	12		2576 Min	0	00	51
	44/19 Min	0	09	36		2577 Min	0	08	35
	44/22 Min	0	10	12		2578 Min	0	03	04
	65/2/1 Min	0	03	29		2579 Min	0	05	82
	65/2/2 Min	0	05	82		2582 Min	0	08	85
	65/3 Min	0	01	01		2585 Min	0	08	85
	65/8 Min	0	03	04		2588 Min	0	08	85
	65/9 Min	0	06	58					



1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Mahrana H. No. 29	44/23 Min	0	10	37	Panipat Taraf Rajputan				
	49/3 Min	0	05	06	H. No. 16	892 Min	0	07	84
	49/4/1 Min	0	02	53		893/1 Min	0	00	51
	49/4/2 Min	0	02	78		991 Min	0	03	79
	49/7/1 Min	0	02	28		992 Min	0	03	79
	49/7/2 Min	0	08	09		995 Min	0	06	32
	49/14 Min	0	10	37		996 Min	0	08	10
	49/17 Min	0	10	37		1012 Min	0	01	26
	49/24 Min	0	08	60		1016 Min	0	08	35
	49/25 Min	0	01	77		1018 Min	0	06	32
	62/4 Min	0	01	01		1021 Min	0	05	57
	62/5 Min	0	09	36		1022 Min	0	04	05
	62/6 Min	0	10	37		1023 Min	0	01	77
	62/15 Min	0	10	37		1122 Min	0	01	26
	62/16 Min	0	09	86		4155/1123/1 Min	0	01	77
	62/25/2 Min	0	02	78		4157/1125 Min	0	00	76
	63/20 Min	0	00	51		1136 Min	0	07	08
	63/21 Min	0	07	84		1137 Min	0	02	53
	65/1 Min	0	09	86		1149 Min	0	02	53
	65/10 Min	0	10	37		1151 Min	0	11	89
	65/11 Min	0	09	86		1156 Min	0	15	18
	65/19 Min	0	03	29		1475/2 Min	0	00	76
	65/20/2 Min	0	04	81		1496 Min	0	00	51
	65/21 Min	0	00	00		1497/1 Min	0	00	76
	65/22 Min	0	09	86		1497/2 Min	0	01	26
	77/2/1 Min	0	08	35		1497/3 Min	0	06	58
	77/2/2 Min	0	01	52		1498 Min	0	01	77
	77/9 Min	0	10	37		1499 Min	0	01	26
	77/12 Min	0	05	56		1500 Min	0	00	51
	106 Min	0	01	77		1503 Min	0	12	65
	186 Min	0	03	54		1504 Min	0	13	91
						1508 Min	0	12	65
Panipat Taraf Rajputan						1519 Min	0	01	77
H. No. 16	693 Min	0	06	83		1520 Min	0	00	00
	694 Min	0	01	77		1524 Min	0	07	36
	695 Min	0	00	00		1525 Min	0	03	79
	698 Min	0	00	76		1528 Min	0	01	77
	698/1 Min	0	01	26		1529 Min	0	07	08
	810 Min	0	09	61		1532 Min	0	01	77
	811 Min	0	01	77		1537 Min	0	01	26
	812 Min	0	05	06		1538 Min	0	12	65
	813 Min	0	06	00		1539 Min	0	15	18
	815 Min	0	04	55		1540 Min	0	00	76
	816 Min	0	00	51		1543 Min	0	00	76
	821 Min	0	01	29		1545 Min	0	06	07
	822 Min	0	08	85		1552 Min	0	08	10
	823 Min	0	00	76		1553 Min	0	05	06
	824 Min	0	08	10		1558 Min	0	02	02
	825 Min	0	00	51		1560 Min	0	02	02
	827 Min	0	00	51		1561 Min	0	10	88
	831 Min	0	00	00		1562 Min	0	00	76
	832 Min	0	04	55		1563 Min	0	03	29
	836 Min	0	00	76		1564 Min	0	02	02
	869/2/2 Min	0	00	76		1572 Min	0	06	32
	872 Min	0	05	57		1573 Min	0	10	63
	873/2 Min	0	08	35		1574 Min	0	02	02
	874 Min	0	10	12		1575 Min	0	03	04
	877 Min	0	00	76		1576 Min	0	03	79
	878 Min	0	04	55		1577 Min	0	00	51
	886 Min	0	08	85		1844 Min	0	00	51
	887 Min	0	01	77		1847 Min	0	02	02
	888 Min	0	07	08		1848 Min	0	09	36
	889 Min	0	05	06		1859 Min	0	04	55
	890 Min	0	11	89		1860 Min	0	13	66
	891 Min	0	01	77					

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Panipat Taraf Rajputan H. No. 16—Contd.	1861 Min	0	00	00	Panipat Taraf Insar H. No. 12	2346 Min	0	00	76
	1864 Min	0	01	77		2347 Min	0	02	53
	1865 Min	0	10	12		2357 Min	0	00	51
	1866 Min	0	06	83		2358 Min	0	07	59
	1867 Min	0	00	00		2360 Min	0	10	12
	1910 Min	0	08	35		5724/2361 Min	0	01	26
	1911 Min	0	01	26		2362 Min	0	13	91
	1917 Min	0	04	55		2363 Min	0	07	59
	1918 Min	0	05	57		2364 Min	0	00	51
	1920 Min	0	00	76		2365 Min	0	09	11
	1923 Min	0	02	02		2366 Min	0	07	59
	1924 Min	0	05	82		2368 Min	0	00	00
	1930 Min	0	03	29		2369 Min	0	02	02
	1931 Min	0	00	51		2370 Min	0	07	08
	1932 Min	0	08	85		2371 Min	0	08	35
	1933 Min	0	01	26		2372 Min	0	10	88
	1947 Min	0	05	82		2373 Min	0	02	53
	1948 Min	0	05	57		2374 Min	0	00	51
	1949/2 Min	0	10	12		2375 Min	0	02	02
	1950 Min	0	00	51		2376 Min	0	01	26
	1953/1 Min	0	01	77		2378 Min	0	02	53
	1969 Min	0	00	51		2379 Min	0	05	57
	1970 Min	0	05	82		2381 Min	0	01	26
	1971 Min	0	00	51		2382 Min	0	04	30
	1972 Min	0	02	02		2385 Min	0	00	51
	1974 Min	0	15	43		3087 Min	0	07	08
	1975 Min	0	01	77		3088 Min	0	11	38
	1976 Min	0	03	04		3094 Min	0	00	00
	1977 Min	0	02	53		3095 Min	0	08	10
	1978 Min	0	02	53		3096 Min	0	10	12
	1979 Min	0	00	51		3097 Min	0	00	00
	3965/1986 Min	0	09	11		3101 Min	0	07	61
	1988 Min	0	07	08		3102 Min	0	15	18
	1989 Min	0	03	79		3104 Min	0	01	77
	1997 Min	0	03	04		3107 Min	0	10	88
	1998 Min	0	01	77		3109 Min	0	00	51
	1999 Min	0	00	51		3110 Min	0	02	53
	2011 Min	0	07	08		3111/2 Min	0	08	85
	2012 Min	0	04	55		3146 Min	0	01	77
	2017 Min	0	01	77					
	2041 Min	0	02	53	Sikandarpur H. No. 19	29/22 Min	0	08	35
						44/2 Min	0	03	54
Sondhpur H. No. 26	18/11 Min	0	02	78		44/9 Min	0	01	01
	19/9 Min	0	05	31		58/9 Min	0	06	07
	19/10/2 Min	0	01	77		58/12 Min	0	10	12
	19/12 Min	0	10	37		58/19 Min	0	07	59
	19/19 Min	0	10	37		58/20 Min	0	02	53
	19/22/1 Min	0	07	33		58/21 Min	0	05	06
	19/22/2 Min	0	03	04		58/22/1 Min	0	04	05
	32/2 Min	0	10	37		59/1 Min	0	09	61
	32/8 Min	0	03	04		59/2 Min	0	00	51
	32/9 Min	0	07	33		59/10 Min	0	08	85
	32/12 Min	0	01	01		299 Min	0	00	76
	32/13 Min	0	09	36	Kabri H. No. 18	26/12 Min	0	02	02
	32/18 Min	0	10	37		26/19 Min	0	10	12
	32/23 Min	0	09	36		26/22 Min	0	10	12
Panipat Taraf Insar H. No. 12	1735 Min	0	00	00		29/2 Min	0	10	12
	1744 Min	0	03	04		29/9 Min	0	10	12
	5612/1745 Min	0	04	30		29/12 Min	0	09	36
	5613/1746 Min	0	07	08		29/19 Min	0	10	12
	1747/1 Min	0	10	63		29/22 Min	0	10	12
	1747/2 Min	0	00	76		42/2/1 Min	0	09	16
						42/9 Min	0	09	36

1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Kabri H. No. 18	42/12 Min	0	10	12		609 Min	0	08	09
	42/19 Min	0	10	12		610 Min	0	07	84
	42/22 Min	0	10	12		612/1 Min	0	08	85
	57/2 Min	0	09	61		612/2 Min	0	00	51
	57/9/2 Min	0	10	12		954/619 Min	0	03	04
	57/12 Min	0	09	36		620 Min	0	05	06
	57/19 Min	0	10	12		621 Min	0	00	51
	57/22 Min	0	08	60		622 Min	0	08	85
	68/2 Min	0	09	61		625 Min	0	01	52
	68/9 Min	0	10	12		626 Min	0	03	04
	68/12/1 Min	0	02	53		627/2 Min	0	08	35
	68/12/2 Min	0	07	59		629 Min	0	01	77
	68/19 Min	0	08	09		630 Min	0	01	52
	68/22 Min	0	03	54		631 Min	0	01	77
	82/2 Min	0	06	58		668 Min	0	01	52
	82/9 Min	0	09	11	Kachhorli H. No. 1	671/2 Min	0	03	04
	82/12 Min	0	10	12		3/20 Min	0	01	01
	82/19 Min	0	10	12		21 Min	0	10	12
	82/22 Min	0	10	12		11/1 Min	0	10	12
	89/2 Min	0	10	12		11/10 Min	0	10	12
	89/9 Min	0	10	12		11/11 Min	0	10	12
	89/12 Min	0	10	12		11/20 Min	0	10	12
	89/19 Min	0	09	36		11/21/1 Min	0	00	76
	89/22 Min	0	05	82		11/21/2 Min	0	07	84
	96/26 Min	0	11	89	Rasta Without Khasra No.				
	116 Min	0	01	52		13/1 Min	0	10	12
	149 Min	0	00	51		13/10 Min	0	10	12
	154 Min	0	00	51		13/11 Min	0	10	12
	163 Min	0	00	76		13/20 Min	0	10	12
	164 Min	0	00	51		13/21 Min	0	10	12
	726 Min	0	00	76		24/1 Min	0	10	12
	731 Min	0	00	76		24/10 Min	0	10	12
	732 Min	0	00	76		24/11 Min	0	10	12
	736 Min	0	00			24/20 Min	0	10	12
Ratipur H. No. 16	12/9 Min	0	07	33		24/21 Min	0	10	12
	12/12 Min	0	10	12		35/1 Min	0	10	12
	12/19 Min	0	10	12		35/10 Min	0	10	12
	12/22 Min	0	09	61		35/11 Min	0	10	12
	21/2 Min	0	10	12		35/20 Min	0	10	12
	21/9 Min	0	10	12		35/21 Min	0	10	12
	21/12 Min	0	10	12		41/1 Min	0	04	55
	21/19 Min	0	10	12					
	21/22 Min	0	10	12					
	29/2 Min	0	10	12					
	29/9 Min	0	10	12					
	29/12/1 Min	0	09	36					
	29/19 Min	0	10	12					
	29/22 Min	0	09	11					
	29/26 Min	0	00	76					
	37/2 Min	0	10	12					
	37/9 Min	0	10	12					
	37/12 Min	0	07	59					
	42/2 Min	0	01	01					
	48/ Min	0	00	51					
Mahmadpur H. No. 15	18/1 Min	0	05	56					
	18/10 Min	0	10	12					
	18/11 Min	0	10	12					
	18/20 Min	0	10	12					
	18/21 Min	0	10	12					
	23/1 Min	0	10	12					
	23/10 Min	0	10	12					
	23/11 Min	0	10	12					
	23/20 Min	0	04	05					
	50 Min	0	01	52					

[No. 12020/19/80-Prod]

KIRAN CHADHA, Under Secy.

## उत्तर मंत्रालय

(कोयल विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 16 दिसम्बर, 1980

का०स्ता० 58.—कोयला खान (राष्ट्रीयकरण) अधिनियम, 1973 (1973 का 26) की धारा 17 की उपधारा (2) के प्रधीन प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए, केंद्र सरकार एन्डव्हारा श्री जो०प०स० चक्रवर्ती को 17-4-1980 (पूर्वान्तर) से लेखा अधिकारी के पद पर पुनः नियुक्त करती है।

[का०स्ता० 11023(3)/80-सी ए]  
टी०सी०ए० श्रीनिवासन, उप सचिव

MINISTRY OF ENERGY  
(Department of Coal)

New Delhi, the 16th December, 1980

S.O. 58.—In exercise of the powers conferred under Sub-section (2) of the Section 17 of the Coal Mines

(Nationalisation) Act, 1973 ((26 of 1973), the Central Government hereby re-appoints Shri S. G. Chakraborty as Accounts Officer with effect from 17-4-1980 (F.N.).

[F. No. 11023(3)/80-CA]  
T. C. A. SRINIVASAN, Dy. Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 18 दिसम्बर, 1980

का० आ० 59--केन्द्रीय सरकार, कोयला खान भविष्य निधि और प्रकार्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 46) की धारा 3-ग की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और भारत सरकार के अम मन्त्रालय की अधिसूचना सं० का० आ० 3745, तारीख 26 अक्टूबर, 1979 को अधिकान्त करने हुए, 9 दिसम्बर, 1980 (अपराह्न) में कोयला खान भविष्य निधि आयुक्त के रूप में श्री डॉ पाण्डा की नियुक्ति अधिसूचित करती है।

[स० ए० 12012/6/78-प्रशा० (पी० एफ०) (i)]

New Delhi, the 18th December, 1980

**S.O. 59.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3C of the Coal Mines Provident Fund and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1948 (46 of 1948), and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour No. S.O. 3745, dated the 26th October, 1979, the Central Government hereby notifies the appointment of Shri D. Panda, as the Coal Mines Provident Fund Commissioner with effect from the 9th day of December, 1980 (afternoon).

[No. A. 12012(6)/78-Adm I(PF)(i)]

का० आ० 60--केन्द्रीय सरकार, कोयला खान भविष्य निधि और प्रकार्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 46) की धारा 9 की उपधारा (2) के अनुसरण में और भारत सरकार के अम मन्त्रालय की अधिसूचना सं० का० आ० 3091, दिनांक 29 अगस्त, 1979 की अधिकान्त करने हुए, श्री डॉ पाण्डा, कोयला खान भविष्य निधि आयुक्त, धनबाद को 9 दिसम्बर, 1980 (अपराह्न) से उक्त उपधारा के प्रयोगों के लिए, प्राधिकारी के रूप में विनियिष्ट करती है।

[स० ए० 12012/6/78-प्रशा० (पी० एफ०) (ii)]  
प० एम० देशपांडे, उप सचिव

**S.O. 60.**—In pursuance of sub-section (2) of section 9 of the Coal Mines Provident Fund and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1948 (46 of 1948) and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour No. S.O. 3091, dated the 29th August, 1979, the Central Government hereby specifies, with effect from the 9th December, 1980 (afternoon), Shri D. Panda, Coal Mines Provident Fund Commissioner, Dhanbad, as the authority for the purposes of said sub-section.

[No. A. 12012(6)/78-Adm. I (PF)(ii)]  
A. S. DESHPANDE, Dy. Secy

हिंषि मंत्रालय

(हिंषि अनुसंधान प्रोग्राम विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 2 दिसम्बर, 1980

का० आ० 61--भारतीय कृषि अनुसंधान परिषद द्वारा बनायी गयी स्थायी वित्त समिति की नियमावली के विनियम 2 (iv) के अनुसरण में तथा ए० पी० उपकर अधिनियम, 1940 के प्रावधान की धारा 7 (2) में निहित व्यवस्था के अनुसरण में, भारतीय कृषि अनुसंधान परिषद के शासी निकाय द्वारा निकाय के निम्नलिखित मक्षस्तों को उनके सामने दी गई

प्रवधि के लिए उन्हें परिषद की स्थायी वित्त समिति का सदस्य चुन लिया गया है —

नाम	प्रवधि
1 श्री चन्द्र शेखर सिंह, लोक सभा सदस्य, पी० आ० बाका, जिला भागलपुर, बिहार	दिनांक 30-9-1980 से एक वर्ष के लिए अधिकारी उसके बाद जब तक उनके उत्तराधिकारियों का विधिवत नियुक्ति न हो, इनमें से जो भी वाद में हो तब तक के लिए।
2 प्र० एन० जी० राघव, लोक सभा सदस्य, निष्ठुरोलु, पोन्डुर (आ० प्र०)	
3 श्री सुजान सिंह, राज्य सभा सदस्य, सुजान सिंह पार्क, सोनीपत	
4. कर्नल अच्छर गिह, गांव तथा डाकघासा सोहन, जिला असम	
5. डा० ईश्वरभाई पटेल, उप-कुनूपति गुजरात कृषि विश्वविद्यालय, अहमदाबाद डा० पी० एन० भादुडी, पी०-1/ 142, कल्याणी (पार्श्वमी बंगल)	दिनांक 30-9-1980 से एक वर्ष के लिए अधिकारी उस समय तक के लिए जब तक वे शासी निकाय के सदस्य बने रहे, इनमें से जो भी पहले हो।
7. डा० दरोगा मिह, निवेशक, भारतीय कृषि मालिकी अनुसंधान सम्पादन, नई बिल्ली	

[स० 2 (1)/79-सी० डी० एन० 1]

क० एन० छावड़ा, अवर सचिव

## MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE

(Department of Agricultural Research & Education)

New Delhi, the 12th December, 1980

**S.O. 61.**—In pursuance of Regulation 2(iv) of the Standing Finance Committee Regulations framed by the Indian Council of Agricultural Research and in pursuance of provision contained in Section 7(2) of the A. P. Cess Act, 1940, the following members of the Government Body of ICAR have been elected by that Body to be members of the Standing Finance Committee for the period shown against each :—

Name	Terms
1. Shri Chandra Shekhar Singh, Member, Lok Sabha, At P. O. Banka, Distt. Bhagalpur Bihar.	For a period of one year w.e.f. 30-9-1980 or till such time thereafter as their successors are duly elected, whichever is later.
2. Prof. N. G. Ranga, Member, Lok Sabha, Nildudrolu, Pondur (A.P.)	
3. Shri Sujan Singh, Member, Rajya Sabha, Sujan Singh Park, Sonepat.	
4. Col. Achhar Singh, Vill. & P.O. Sohal, Distt. Anuitsar (Punjab).	
5. Dr. Ishwarbhai Patel, Vice-Chancellor, Gujarat Agricultural University, Ahmedabad.	For a period of one year w.e.f. 30-9-80 or till such time as they continue to be members of the Governing Body, whichever is earlier.
6. Dr. P. N. Bhaduri, P-1/142, Kalyani (W.B.)	
7. Dr. Daroga Singh, Director, Indian Agricultural Statistics Research Institute, New Delhi.	

[No. 2(1)/79-CDN. 1]

K. L. CHHAB Under Secy.

## नौवाहन और परिवहन मंशालय

(मौष्यहस पक्ष)

नई दिल्ली, 18 दिसम्बर, 1980

काठ ४० आ० ६२।—राष्ट्रीय नौवकून बोई नियम, १९६० के नियम ३ के साथ पठित व्यापार पास अधिनियम, १९५८ (१९५८ का ४४) की भारा ४ वें द्वारा द्वारा प्रकृत शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एनद्वारा नीचे लिखे मदरसों को नियुक्ति कर राष्ट्रीय नौवकून बोई की स्थापना करनी है और श्री दौलत गिह जाइज़ा, समद मदरस्य को उक्त बोई का ग्रन्थानामित करनी है, अर्थात्—

- |  |   |                              |
|--|---|------------------------------|
| 1. श्री जं० मी० वर्णे  | } | लोक सभा द्वारा निर्वाचित     |
| 2. श्री दौलत मिह जी जादेजा   |   |                              |
| 3. श्री बापू माधवि पारुलकर   |   |                              |
| 4. श्री कें० ए० स्वामी   |   |                              |
| 5. श्री सुरेन्द्र माठन   | } | राज्य सभा द्वारा निर्वाचित   |
| 6. श्री प्रकाश मेहरोत्रा   |   |                              |
| 7. मचिव, नौवहन और परिषद्धन<br>मंत्रालय प्रधाना उनके द्वारा<br>मयुक्त मचिव के स्तर तक का<br>नामित प्रधिकारी | } |                              |
| 8. मचिव, वाणिज्य मंत्रालय अथवा<br>उनके हांग संयुक्त मचिव<br>के स्तर तक का नामित<br>प्रधिकारी               |   |                              |
| 9. उप मुख्य अल संना स्टाफ, जल<br>सेवा सुधारालय, रक्षा मंत्रालय   | } | केन्द्रीय सरकार के प्रतिनिधि |
| 10. वित्तीय मंत्रालयकार नौवहन और<br>परिषद्धन मंत्रालय  |   |                              |
| 11. नौवहन महानिदेशक  | } |                              |
| 12. अध्यक्ष, भारतीय नौवहन नियम <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>लिं० बच्चई</li></ol>                  |   |                              |
| 13. श्री टी० एन० गोकुल दास   | } | जहाज मालिकों के प्रतिनिधि    |
| 14. श्री एन० एच० धनर्जी भाई  |   |                              |
| 15. श्री ह०के० मुख्या  | } | भारतीय समुद्री सघ            |
| 16. श्री लोकेंद्र वारंस  |   |                              |
| 17. श्री प्रमिन मित्रा   | } | गाविकों के प्रतिनिधि         |
| 18. श्री बी० डी० चौगले अग्रिम<br>भारतीय जहाज मालिक परिषद   |   |                              |
| 19. श्री जे० एच० दोर्पी, भारतीय<br>वाणिज्य नथा उच्चोग महासंघ   | } |                              |
| 20. श्री झी० एम० पारेख, जल<br>पोत उद्योग   |   |                              |
| 21. केन्द्रीय सरकार नौवहन उपमहानिदेशक, श्री आ० पद्मनाभन<br>को उक्त वर्षों का मचिव नियमित करती है।          | } |                              |

[स० एम० ड्व्हल्य/एम० एम० बी०-१/४०-एम०एफ०]

## विश्वानाथ शर्मा अथवा सचिव

**MINISTRY OF SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT**  
**(Shipping Wing)**

New Delhi, the 18th December, 1920.

**S. O. 62**—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 4 of the Merchant Shipping Act 1958 (44 of 1958), read with rule 3 of the National Shipping Board Rules, 1960, the Central Government hereby establishes a National Shipping Board consisting of the following members and nominees:

Shri Daulat Singh Jadeja, M.P., to be the Chairman of the said Board namely:—

- |  |                                       |
|--|---------------------------------------|
| 1. Shri J. C. Barve  | } Elected by the Lok Sabha.           |
| 2. Shri Daulat Singhji Jadeja  |                                       |
| 3. Shri Bapusaheb Patulekar  | } Elected by the Rajya Sabha.         |
| 4. Shri K. A. Swami  |                                       |
| 5. Shri Surendra Mohan   | } Elected by the Rajya Sabha.         |
| 6. Shri Prakash Mehrotra   |                                       |
| 7. Secretary, Ministry of Shipping and Transport, or his nominee not below the level of Joint Secretary.                           | } Central Government representatives. |
| 8. Secretary, Ministry of Commerce, or his nominee not below the level of Joint Secretary.   |                                       |
| 9. Deputy Chief of Naval Staff, Naval Headquarters, Ministry of Defence  | } Central Government representatives. |
| 10. Financial Adviser, Ministry of Shipping and Transport.   |                                       |
| 11. Director General of Shipping, Bombay.  | } Maritime Union of India.            |
| 12. The Chairman, Shipping Corporation of India Ltd., Bombay.  |                                       |
| 13. Shri T. M. Goculdas  | } Representatives of Shipowners.      |
| 14. Shri N. H. Dhunjibhoy  |                                       |
| 15. Shri E. K. Sukhia  | } Maritime Union of India.            |
| 16. Shri Leo Barnes  |                                       |
| 17. Shri Asit Mitra  | } Representatives of Seamen.          |
| 18. Shri V. D. Chowgule  |                                       |
| 19. Shri J. H. Doshi   | } All India Shippers, Council.        |
| 20. Shri D. M. Parekh  |                                       |
| 2. The Central Government appoints Shri R. Padmanabhan, Deputy Director General of Shipping to be the Secretary of the said Board. | Sailing Vessels Industry.             |

[No. SW/MSB-1/80-MF.]

## पर्यटन और नागर विसानन संबालय

नई दिल्ली, १६ दिसम्बर १९८०

का० धा० 63 —वायु नियम अधिनियम, 1953 (1953 का 27) की धारा १ हारा प्रदत्त शर्कियों का प्रयोग करने सुन्, राष्ट्रपति गणद्वारा श्री क० के० श्रीयामस्य, महानिदेशक (पर्यटन) का धी रा० बी० जैन के स्थान पर तस्काल एवं १७ जून, १९४२ तक ऐस्यु हड्डिया तथा इच्छित ऐस्यु लाइस के निदेशक मकान में निदेशक नियकन करने वै।

[स० ए० वी० १/८०/१/३/३/८०/-ए०स०० (ए०)]  
वी० तलसीदास, अवर सचिव

## MINISTRY OF TOURISM AND CIVIL AVIATION

New Delhi, the 16th December, 1980

**S.O. 63.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 4 of the Air Corporations Act, 1953 (27 of 1953), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri K. K. Srivastava, Director General (Tourism) as Director on the Boards of Air India and Indian Airlines with immediate effect and upto 17th June, 1982 vice Shri C. B. Jain.

[No. AV. 18013/3/80-AC(A)]

नई दिल्ली, 20 दिसम्बर, 1980

**का० आ० 64।—प्रतिरूप विमानपत्तन प्राधिकरण अधिनियम, 1971 (1971 का 43) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (3) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार प्राद्वारा श्री के० के० श्रीवास्तव, महानिदेशक (पर्षटन) का थी सी० बी० जैन के स्थान पर तलाल तीन वर्ष की अवधि के लिए भारत अंतर्राष्ट्रीय विमानपत्तन प्राधिकरण का अपकालिक मदस्य नियुक्त करती है।**

[प० ए० व० 24012/1/79-ए०]

गोपल चतुर्वेदी, उप सचिव

New Delhi, the 20th December, 1980

**S.O. 64.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-Section (3) of Section 3 of the International Airports Authority Act, 1971 (43 of 1971) the Central Government hereby appoints Shri K. K. Srivastava, Director General (Tourism) as part time Member of the International Airports Authority of India, with immediate effect, for a period of three years, vice Shri C. B. Jain.**

[No. AV. 24012/1/79-AA]

GOPAL CHATURVEDI, Dy. Secy.

### आम भेदभाव

आवेदा

नई दिल्ली, 15 नवम्बर, 1980

**का० आ० 65।—केन्द्रीय सरकार का रूप है कि इससे उत्पादक अनुसूची में विनियोजित विषय के बारे में परादीप पाठ दृष्ट, परादीप के प्रबन्ध मठन से सम्बद्ध एक श्रीरामिक विवाद नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच विश्वासा है;**

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद का व्यायनिर्णय के लिये निर्देशित करना बाल्यनीय समझती है;

इति, केन्द्रीय सरकार, श्रीरामिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7-क और धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खड़ (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्ति 1 का प्रयोग करते हुए, एक श्रीरामिक अधिकरण गठित करती है जिसके पाठाराजन अधिकारी श्री प० व० रमाराज छांगे, जिनका मुख्यालय मद्रास में है और उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिकरण का व्यायनिर्णय के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

### अनुसूची

क्या पेरादीप पाठ दृष्ट के प्रबन्ध मठन का थी आ० रा० रा० शाम द्वारा 17-12-62 से 30-9-65 तक राधाकाशपट्टमैन के रूप में के, राई सेवा को जेष्ट फ्रापट्टमैन के सर्वे में उक्ता जेष्टा के निधिण के प्रवाजनर्य न गिनते का कानूनाई व्याप्रित है? पाद नहीं, तो सबत्रित कर्मकार विषय अनुताप का हकदार है श्री राम तारीख से

[प० ए० व० ३०१२/२/७९-ए० IV (१)]

### MINISTRY OF LABOUR

#### ORDERS

New Delhi, the 15th November, 1980

**S.O. 65.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Paradip Port Trust, Paradip and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;**

And, whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7A, and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10, of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri M. V. Gangaraju shall be the Presiding Officer, with headquarters at Bhubaneswar and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

#### SCHEDULE

Whether the action of the management of Paradip Port Trust in not counting the service rendered by Shri R. C. Das as Assistant Draftsman from 17-12-62 to 30-9-65 for the purpose of Fixation of his seniority in the cadre of senior Draftsman is justified? If not, to what relief is the concerned workman entitled and from what date?

[No. L-38012/2/79-D. IV(A)]

नई दिल्ली, 18 दिसम्बर, 1980

**का० आ० 66।—केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इसी उपचार अनुसूची में विनियोजित विषय के बारे में मैसर्ज ज० व० ब० बोडा मैरीन एण्ड जनरल सर्वे एजेंसीज प्राइवेट लिं, मद्रास के प्रबन्धनडल से सम्बद्ध एक श्रीरामिक विवाद नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच विश्वासा है;**

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद का व्यायनिर्णय के लिए निर्देशित करना बाल्यनीय समझती है;

इति, केन्द्रीय सरकार, श्रीरामिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7-क और धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खड़ (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, एक श्रीरामिक अधिकरण गठित करती है जिसके पाठाराजन अधिकारी श्री ए० र० मूद्रमनम डेनियल हैंगे, जिनका मुख्यालय मद्रास में है और उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिकरण का व्यायनिर्णय के लिये निर्देशित करती है।

### अनुसूची

क्या मैसर्ज ज० व० ब० बोडा मैरीन एण्ड जनरल सर्वे एजेंसीज प्राइवेट लिं, मद्रास के प्रबन्धनडल की नियोजित अनुसूची 37 कर्मकारों का 19 फरवरी, 1980 की ताम्री पारी से गोधे नियोजन से इन्कार करते और उन्हें मैसर्ज चलन्ड एजेंसीज, मद्रास, टेकेदार के पास नियोजन के लिए रिपोर्ट करने के लिए कहने को कारबाई व्यायामित है? यदि नहीं, तो सवधित कर्मकार किए अनुताप का हकदार है!

### कर्मकारों के नाम

1. श्री ए० र० गृनशेखरन
2. श्री ज० र० राधाकृष्णन
3. श्री व० ह० राधाकृष्णन
4. श्री ए० शेखर मनोहरन
5. श्री आर० जनमुद्धम
6. श्री ए० ए० र० रमेश
7. श्री सी० भाशा
8. श्री ज० श्वी भाशर
9. श्री सी० आर० सच्चिन्द्रन
10. श्री क० सूरीयान
11. श्री आर० वेकटरमण
12. श्री ई० गुरुनाथन
13. श्री ए० महेन
14. श्री आर० व० श्रीनिवासन
15. श्री आर० अ० जोहन
16. श्री मौनिज थार्डेर
17. श्री ए० नदरजन
18. श्री ट० ए० मून्दमेश्वरन
19. श्री ए० ट० शिवप्रकाशन
20. श्री ई० आनन्दन

21. श्री केंद्र पट्टो
22. श्री पंते राधाकृष्णन
23. श्री नेंद्र देविंद्र
24. श्री एने पस० दिव्यसुदूर
25. श्री ए० गवालैम
26. श्री टी० रथनदेव
27. श्री जयचन्द्रन
28. श्री हौ० आलाकृष्णन
29. श्री वी० नटनाराजन
30. श्री आ० एमाकृष्णन
31. श्री अर्नैड वॉयन
32. श्री फैकर
33. श्री एस० पी० सुरेशकुमार
34. श्री कें श्रीनिवासन
35. श्री कें चित्ताहुराई
36. श्री डी० आर० पूरनचन्द्रन
37. श्री बाई० शाहू

[म० 33011/3/80-श्री IV (प्र)]

नन्द लाल, हेमा अपिकारी

New Delhi, the 18th December, 1980

**S.O. 66.**—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of Messrs J. B. Boda Marine and General Survey Agencies Pvt. Ltd., Madras and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7A, and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10, of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri T. Sundaresanam Daniel shall be the Presiding Officer, with headquarters at Madras and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

#### SCHEDULE

Whether the action of the management of Messrs J. B. Boda Marine and General Survey Agencies Private Limited, Madras in refusing direct employment to the undermentioned 37 workmen with effect from the third shift of 19th February, 1980 and asking them to report to Messrs Chandran Agencies, Madras, Contractor, for employment is justified? If not, to what relief are the concerned workmen entitled?

#### Names of the workmen

1. Shri M. Gunasekharan
2. Shri G. Radhakrishnan
3. Shri Y. Radhakrishnan
4. Shri M. Sekhar Manoharan
5. Shri R. Shanmugham
6. Shri H. S. Ramesh
7. Shri C. Basha
8. Shri J. Sindha Madhar
9. Shri C. R. Santhanakrishnan
10. Shri K. Suriyan
11. Shri R. Venkataraman
12. Shri E. Gurunathan
13. Shri A. Mohan
14. Shri R. V. Srivivasan
15. Shri R. Ali John
16. Shri Moses Theodore
17. Shri A. Natarajan
18. Shri T. A. Sundareswaran
19. Shri M. D. Shivaprakashan
20. Shri E. Anandan
21. Shri K. Anto

22. Shri N. Radhakrishnan
23. Shri J. David
24. Shri N. S. Vijayasundari
25. Shri A. Ramadoss
26. Shri T. Ravindran
27. Shri Jayachandrar
28. Shri P. Balakrishnan
29. Shri V. Natarajan
30. Shri R. Ramakrishnan
31. Shri Bernard Vargos
32. Shri Sankar
33. Shri S. P. Sureshkumar
34. Shri K. Srinivasan
35. Shri K. Chinnadurai
36. Shri D. R. Poornachandiran
37. Shri Y. Babu.

[No. L-33011/3/80-D. IV(A)]

NAND LAL, Desk Officer

New Delhi, the 12th December, 1980

**S.O. 67.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 2, Dhanbad, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Bastacolla Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Dhansar, District Dhanbad and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 6th December, 1980.

#### BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) DHANBAD

#### Reference No. 19 of 1979

In the matter of an industrial dispute under S. 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947.

#### PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Bastacolla colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post office Dhansar, District Dhanbad

AND

Their workmen.

#### APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the employers : Shri S. K. Choudhury, General Manager (P), Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., Dhanbad.

On behalf of the workmen : Lala B. P. Sinha, Central Executive Member, Rashtiya Colliery Mazdoor Sangh, Dhanbad.

STATE : Bihar.

INDUSTRY : Coal.

Dhanbad, 28th November, 1980

#### AWARD

This is a reference under S. 10 of the I. D. Act, 1947, The Central Government by its notification No. L-20012/189/78-D.III(A) dated 30th March, 1979 has referred this dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication on the following terms :

#### SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Bastacolla colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post office Dhansar District Dhanbad in stopping from work of Shri Sukhdev Prasad, Moulder and Saravshri Mahendra Ram, Arjun Prasad and Dinesh Prasad, Moulder Hepler is justified? If not, to what relief are the said workmen entitled and from what date?"

2. After receipt of the reference written statements were filed by the parties. The reference thereafter proceeded along its course and ultimately today a memorandum of settlement was filed by the parties incorporating therein the terms of settlement arrived at between them in respect of the industrial dispute pending for adjudication in this Tribunal. As per the settlement the management have agreed to offer fresh employment to all the concerned workmen. Since the settlement

is beneficial to both the parties, I accept the same. Accordingly, I pass the award in terms of the settlement which do form part of the award.

J P. SINGH, Presiding Officer

BEFORE THE HON'BLE PRESIDING OFFICER CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2)  
AT DHANBAD

Reference No. 19 of 1979

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Bastacolla Colliery of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., P.O. Dhansar, Dist. Dhanbad.

AND

Their workmen represented by Rashtriya Colliery Mazdoor Sangh, Rajendra Path, Dhanbad (hereinafter described as the Union).

The parties named above beg most respectfully to submit as under :

I. That the parties above named have since discussed the matter with a view to amicably settle the dispute. Without prejudice the contention of the parties it is agreed to resolve the dispute on the following terms and conditions :

Term<sup>s</sup> of Agreement

- (a) It is agreed that Shri Sukhdeo Prasad will be offered employment afresh as Moulder Helper in Category-II and will be placed in Central Workshop, Ektra or any other workshop.
- (b) That Shri Arjun Prasad will be offered employment afresh as Welder Trainee in Category-I and will be placed in Central Workshop or other suitable place.
- (c) That Shri Mahinder Ram and Shri Dinesh Prasad will be offered fresh employment as Miner/Loader and will be placed in any colliery of Kustore Area.
- (d) All the above 4 persons will report for duty within 15 days from the date of the agreement.

II. It is agreed that the above compromise finally resolves the pending dispute before the Hon'ble Central Government Industrial Tribunal.

It is, therefore, prayed that the Hon'ble Tribunal may be pleased to accept the above compromise as fair and reasonable and pass an award in terms thereof.

For the Management

(S. K. CHOWDHARY)  
General Manager (Pars)

(RAVINDRA SINGH)

General Manager Bastacolla Area

Witness :

1. मुकदेश प्रसाद	27-11-80
2. अर्जुन प्रसाद	27-11-80
3. महेन्द्र राम	27-11-80
4. विनेश प्रसाद	27-11-80

[No. L-20012/187/78-D.III(A)]

S. H. S. IYER, Desk Officer

New Delhi, the 18th December 1980

**S.O. 68.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 2, Dhanbad, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of the Civil Engineering Department of Messrs. Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Karmik Bhawan, At and Post Office Saraidhella,

District Dhanbad and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 9th December, 1980.

BEFORE SHRI J. P. SINGH, PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (No. 2)  
DHANBAD

Reference No. 95 of 1979

In the matter of an industrial dispute under S. 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947.

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of the Civil Engineering Department of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Karmik Bhawan, At and Post office Saraidhella, District Dhanbad

AND

Their workmen.

APPARANCES :

On behalf of the employers : Shri S. S. Mukherjee, Advocate.

On behalf of the workmen : Shri R. Prasad, General Secretary, Bharat Coking Coal Staff Coordination, Jharia, Dhanbad.

STATE : Bihar

INDUSTRY : Coal

Dhanbad, 5th December, 1980.

AWARD

This is a reference under S. 10 of the I.D. Act, 1947. The Central Government by its notification No. L-20012/69/79/D.III(A) dated 27th July, 1979 has referred this dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication on the following terms :

SCHEDULE

"Whether the demand of the workmen of Civil Engineering Department of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Karmik Bhawan, At and Post office Saraidhella, District Dhanbad that Shri Girdhari Lal, Assistant should be promoted to Grade-I with effect from the date on which his juniors were promoted and that he should be paid wages from the 30th December, 1975, is justified? If so, to what relief is the said workman entitled?"

2. The concerned workman, Shri Girdhari Lal, was working as attendance clerk of Jealgora colliery of M/s. East India Coal Co. (P) Ltd, when the management of the colliery was taken over by the Central Government w.e.f. 17-10-1971. At the time of take over of the management the concerned workman was in clerical grade II of the Coal Wage Board recommendation since the time of his appointment i.e. from 15-1-69. With effect from 28-7-72 he was posted to perform clerical duties in the Legal Department. Thereafter on 16-12-76 he was transferred to carry on clerical duties in Security Department, whereafter he was transferred to Civil Engineering Department on 1-11-77.

3. Before the management the question of promotion of clerical staff from grade II to grade I arose in the year 1975 in which the management also considered the case of the concerned workman along with several others. W.E.F. 30-12-75 a large number of persons were promoted from grade II to grade I. But the concerned workman was not promoted and superseded by several other junior staff. In 1977 the question of promotion was again considered and the name of the concerned workman was also considered. The concerned workman again could not be promoted and was superseded by several other juniors.

4. The case put forth by the concerned workman is that only a few months after the take over of the management and the nationalisation of the colliery he was posted to the Legal Department where his work was found to be satisfactory by his superior officers. In fact the Legal Adviser, Shri Sarda Prasad under whom Shri Girdhari Lal was working, made recommendations in 1974 about his promotion. No reason was assigned as to why the concerned workman was not selected

for promotion by the Departmental Promotion Committee when he fulfilled the two criteria of promotion, viz. (1) seniority and (2) satisfactory service. With regard to the rejection of his case for promotion in 1977 the concerned workman came to know that the confidential report of the service during 1976 was not submitted to the D.P.C. by the Personnel Department.

5 The prayer of the union is that the concerned workman Shri Girdhari Lal should be promoted to grade I w.e.f. 30-12-75 and allowed the difference of wages, bonus etc between grade I and grade II from 30-12-75.

6 According to the management the Bharat Coking Coal Ltd. has a promotion policy framed in consultation with the workmen's representatives and the promotion matter has to be considered and recommended by the D.P.C. In order to consider the case of promotion of clerical staff one such Departmental Promotion Committee was formed in 1975 and again in 1977. The management has said that the D.P.C. both the times assessed the performance and other qualifications necessary for promotion so far as Shri Girdhari Lal was concerned and declined to recommend his case for promotion. The standard fixed by the D.P.C. was stated to be rational and applied in each case without any distinction. Shri Girdhari Lal was not promoted because he failed to come upto the standard necessary for promotion. It is further said that the C.C.R. of the workmen was examined by the D.P.C. both the times and the concerned workman was found below the standard.

7 No oral evidence was adduced in this case. But both the parties have filed documents. Ext. M1 is an attested copy of C.C.R. of Shri Girdhari Lal for the period 1-1-74 to 30-6-75. Ext. M2 is an attested copy of minutes of D.P.C. held on 8-12-75. Ext. M3 is an attested copy of the minutes of D.P.C. held on 25-6-77. These were marked on admission.

8 On behalf of the union Ext. W 1 has been filed which is a note I.A. U.O. No. 415 dated 10-12-74 from Legal Adviser to the Director (Commercial). Ext. W 2 is a copy of note I.A. U.O. I No. 1 dated 3-1-76 from Vice Legal Adviser Shri N. C. Dutta to the Chief Personnel Manager. Ext. W 3 is a copy of letter No. 4531(A) dated 30-9-75 certificate issued by Shri Sardar Prasad, Legal Adviser to the concerned workman and Ext. W 4 is a copy of report No. 1360/78.D.S. dated 7th April, 1979 of the Assistant Labour Commissioner (C) Dhanbad to the Secretary, Government of India Ministry of Labour New Delhi. Ext. W 5 is a copy of the promotion policy of B.C.C.I. issued on June, 1977 under which provision has been made for constitution of D.P.C. and the guide lines to be followed in the matter of election for promotion. The concerned workman is relying on paragraph 6.1 which may be quoted below.

"For the purpose of promotion from Gr. III to Gr. II and from Gr. II to Gr. I employees will be promoted on the basis of seniority as the main criteria, subject their satisfactory performance."

The minimum qualification was also provided in Annexures A & B to this policy. In annexure B grade I clerk must be matriculate with 2 years experience in the grade below. The concerned workman is a matriculate and had put in more than 2 years service before the first D.P.C. was constituted.

9 Now let us see what conclusions can be drawn on the basis of evidence in this case. It is an admitted position that the concerned workman, Shri Girdhari Lal has been working as a clerk in Grade II since the time of his appointment in the year 1969. It is also admitted that in 1972 he was transferred to Legal Department. There is Ext. W. 1 which is a copy of a note sheet by Shri Sardar Prasad, Legal Adviser to the Director (Commercial) which is dated 30-12-74. This was for the creation of one post of Grade I clerk for Legal Department and promotion of Shri Girdhari Lal, grade II clerk to the post of grade I clerk. It appears from this document that the Legal Adviser had discussed this matter with the Director (Commercial) in a review meeting held on 13-12-74. The Legal Adviser was of the view that from the time Shri Girdhari Lal joined his department he had been doing some responsible jobs such as checking of bills of Advocates, maintaining the registers of accounts and maintaining the library of the department. He was of the view that Shri Girdhari Lal was well behaved, disciplined and his work had given him entire satisfaction. In the opinion of the Legal

Adviser Shri Girdhari Lal was doing grade I job on pay and allowance of grade II clerk due to non-allotment of a grade I post to the Legal Department. He recommended that the placement of Shri Girdhari Lal in grade I was well merited.

10 We have Ext. W. 2 which is a note sheet by Shri N. C. Dutta I.A. U.O. to the Chief Personnel Manager in which a note sheet, Ext. W. 1 was referred by him. He held the same view as the Legal Adviser did in Ext. W. 1 in respect of the merits and efficiency of the concerned workman. He strongly recommended his case for promotion. Ext. W. 2 is dated 3-1-76.

11 It will appear that the Legal Department where Shri Girdhari Lal commenced work shortly after the nationalisation of this colliery recommended his case strongly for promotion which could not be as the case if his C.C.R. was in any manner against his efficiency. Moreover, a copy of the C.C.R. from 1-1-74 to 30-6-75, Ext. M1 has been filed by the management. In Part II of Ext. M1 we find that there are 8 items covering—(1) Personality, (2) Aptitude, (3) Integrity, (4) Reliability, (5) Promptness in performing assignment, (6) Punctuality, (7) Temperament and (8) Capacity to assume responsibility. In all these he has obtained C which is equivalent to good meaning thereby that he has done his job satisfactorily. There is again the C.C.R. for the year 1976 and 1977 in which he has earned mostly B and C remarks. It cannot therefore be said that before the D.P.C. any document was placed which would go to show that Shri Girdhari Lal had a bad character roll which rendered his service unsatisfactory. The minutes of D.P.C. held on 8-12-75 (Ext. M2) shows that according to seniority list Shri Girdhari Lal was No. 13 and against his name the assessment is 20. The maximum marks obtained appears to be 50. I do not understand the criteria for marking because the same has not been explained to me. Then again in Ext. M3 Shri Girdhari Lal has been placed in the seniority list as No. 19 in which the remark against him is 'No'. The others who had been selected for promotion had been shown to be OK. It means that the marking system had undergone change in the subsequent D.P.C. Nothing has been explained to me as to how Shri Girdhari Lal has earned a 'No' in face of the recommendations made by the Legal Department where he worked. Moreover, as I have said the confidential remark showed that his work was good and satisfactory. Even according to the promotion policy the seniority and satisfactory service had to be considered and in both these matters Shri Girdhari Lal fulfilled the requirements. I therefore fail to see any reason why Shri Girdhari Lal in the year 1975 as well as in 1977 was allowed to be superseded by the juniors. On behalf of the workmen it has been submitted that the D.P.C. acted arbitrarily in considering the case of the concerned workman and the management adopted unfair labour practice in refusing to promote him. It may be mentioned that during July, 1979 Shri Girdhari Lal was promoted to grade I. To my mind, it is clear, that the promotion of Shri Girdhari Lal was delayed by the management for no good reason whatsoever. At least it has not been shown before me that there was anything wrong with Shri Girdhari Lal in the matter of seniority or C.C.R. which rendered him unfit for promotion in the year 1975 or in 1977. The workmen's contention is that since the C.C.R. for 1976 had not been sent by the Administrative Department to the D.P.C. his case was not considered. The management has nothing to say about it. Now if this is true it was unfair on the part of the D.P.C. to reject the case of his promotion due to the default on the part of the Administrative Department.

11 Thus, having considered all aspects of the case I hold that the demand of the workmen of Civil Engineering Department of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Karmik Bhawan, At and Post office Saraidhella, District Dhanbad that Shri Girdhari Lal Assistant should be promoted to Grade-I with effect from the date on which his juniors were promoted and that he should be paid wages from the 30th December, 1975 is justified. Consequently, Shri Girdhari Lal, Assistant is entitled to all the back wages and other emoluments with effect from 30th December, 1975.

This is my award.

J. P. SINGH, Presiding Officer,  
Central Govt. Industrial Tribunal (No. 2) Dhanbad.

[No. L-20012/69/79-D.III(A)]

S. H. S. IYER, Desk Officer

New Delhi, the 19th December, 1980

**S.O. 69**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal Hyderabad, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Ramagundam Division No. 1 Godavari Khani, Karimnagar District, Andhra Pradesh and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 9th December, 1980.

**BEFORE THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (CENTRAL) AT HYDERABAD**

**Industrial Dispute No. 15 of 1979**

**BETWEEN**

**Workman of Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Ramagundam Division No. 1, Godavari Khani, Karimnagar District (A.P.).**

**AND**

**The Management of Singareni Collieries Company Limited Ramagundam Division No. 1, Godavari Khani, Karimnagar District (A.P.).**

**APPEARANCES :**

1. Shri A. Lakshmana Rao, Advocate for the Workman.
2. Shri K. Srinivasa Murthy, Advocate for the Management.

**AWARD**

On an industrial dispute that arose between the Management of Ramagundam Division No. 1 of the Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Post Office Godavari Khani, District Karimnagar (Andhra Pradesh) and their Workman in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule, the Government of India by its Order F No. L. 21012(21)/78-D IV(B), Ministry of Labour, New Delhi dated 12-3-1979 referred the same to this Tribunal for adjudication under Section 7A and 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

**SCHEDULE**

"Whether the action of the Management of Singareni Collieries Company Limited in dismissing from service Shri B Narayana, Clerk, Godavari Khani No. 2A Incline with effect from 11th June, 1978 is justified? If not to what relief is the concerned Workman entitled?"

2 The case of the Workman is briefly as follows:—He joined the service of this Management in 1964 and served for 14 years without any blemish. While he was working as Clerk at the Office of the Coal Screening Plant at Godavari Khani, a Charge-sheet dated 23-2-1978 with false allegations was served, and a case was foisted on him at the instance of Shri Mandadi Vengaiah, Commission Agent for coal and Sri Abdul Hameed, Watchman. He had not committed any misconduct as alleged in the charge sheet and the order of dismissal dated 11-6-1978 is illegal and unjustified. The report is based entirely on the evidence of Management's witnesses eschewing from consideration the Workman's evidence without any justification. The Enquiry Officer failed to consider two important facts (1) that it took nearly 24 hours for the Management to record the statement of M. Vengaiah and (2) when Mr. Vengaiah stated that (Rainiah) was with him when he paid a sum of Rs. 500 to the Workman as bribe at about 7.15 P.M. on 17-2-1978, a different person by name Kasalah was examined in regard to the same. But on that day he worked in the Office in General Shift and he had nothing to do with the issue of challans, lorry loading, and weightment of lorries. In the light of clear evidence that he left Godavari Khani by bus at 6.30 P.M. and reached Ramagundam Railway Station at 7.00 P.M. on 17-2-1978, the Enquiry Officer should have seen that he was not at all present at the alleged place and time to receive bribe, and the case was foisted against him at the instance of Vengaiah and the Watchman, and the Senior Inspector, S&PC took advantage of the alleged incident to implicate this Workman because of the grudge he bore against this Workman. The Enquiry Officer disbelieved the evidence of the witness produced on behalf of this Workman on the ground of tendency of a Civil suit against him filed by the Management. This is obviously an untenable ground. This Workman had nothing to do with the lorry loading, weightment or issuing challans. In awarding punishment, the

Management failed to take into consideration the previous record and extenuating circumstances as required under Standing Order 16(c) and on this ground alone the order of dismissal is liable to be set aside. At any rate the punishment is excessive and he is entitled for reinstatement with back wages and attendant benefits.

3. The case of the Management is briefly as follows:—An enquiry has been conducted into the charge levelled against this Workman and in the enquiry it was found that he was guilty of the charges. So the allegations that a false case was foisted against this Workman at the instance of Vengaiah and Watchman is not correct. The Enquiry Officer found the Workman guilty of the charges on the basis of the evidence on record and the same cannot be said to be perverse. Even after taking into account the past record of the Workman, the Management did not find any extenuating circumstances to award a lesser punishment than that of dismissal for the mis-conduct committed by him. As the punishment awarded to this Workman is just and valid, the reference has to be rejected.

4. My learned Predecessor held by order dated 19-2-1980 that the domestic enquiry which was conducted by this Management was fair and proper and hence I have not referred to the respective pleadings of both sides with regard to the same. So the only points that have to be considered are : (1) Whether there are any circumstances warranting interference with the finding of the Enquiry Officer and (2) if there are no circumstances to interfere with the finding of the Enquiry Officer, whether there are any grounds to interfere with the punishment.

5. Point 1:—The Management examined the witnesses to prove its version. Mandadi Vengaiah is a commission agent of Sri Bathi Padda Venkataiah of Hanamakonda and he stated as follows:—On 17-2-1978 he took the permit from this Management at about 10 A.M. and he went to the C.S.P. Office of this Management and took permission for loading two lorries. Between 3 P.M. to 4.30 P.M. on the same day, he got two more lorries and then again he took permission from the C.S.P. Engineer for getting those two lorries loaded. The fourth lorry bearing No. AAT 1642 was sent to lorry weighbridge for obtaining the weight of the empty lorry and he arranged for its loading. In the meanwhile, the three other lorries brought by him were loaded and sent away. At about 7.00 to 7.15 P.M. on the same day, the Workman herein called him to the tea shop and demanded an amount of Rs. 600 from him for releasing one lorry with coal without challan and permit. The Workmen herein wanted to spare Rs. 100 to the Watchman. First the said Vengaiah was not agreeable for the said course and later on he told the Workman that he would pay only Rs. 500 and he paid that amount to the Workman, and the Workman herein agreed for the same. Then the Workman gave two challans and Rs. 100 out of those Rs. 500 to Vengaiah asking him to pay the same to the Watchman at the check post by asking him to state to Watchman 'Narayana' and if any trouble would arise he could represent that he had forgotten to bring the challan.

6. Abdul Hameed, the Watchman of this Management stated as follows:—At about 5 P.M. on 17-2-1978 this Workman came to him and requested him to release one loaded lorry without challan by taking an amount of Rs. 100. But he did not agree. Then this Workman requested him to reconsider about it and he would again come at 7 P.M. and he left the place. Then he sent word to Junior Inspector of this Management asking him to come to the check-post. Then that Junior Inspector went to this Watchman at about 5.40 P.M. on the same day and this Watchman informed him as to what transpired between him and this Workman. Then the Junior Inspector informed this Watchman that he would immediately go to the Senior Inspector, and asked this Watchman to tell this Workman that he would agree for that course if he would again come to him. Then the Junior Inspector went to the Senior Inspector and both of them came to this Watchman and stood in a cabin behind this Watchman from 6.30 P.M., at about 7.00 P.M. this Workman came to this Watchman and asked for his opinion for releasing the lorry and then this Watchman agreed for it and both the Inspectors heard the conversation between the Workman and this Watchman. The lorry AAT 1642 with coal reached the gate and when this Watchman asked for the challan, Vengaiah gave Rs. 100 and faked challan and when this Watchman called the Inspectors while stating loudly 'Sab, Sab', then Vengaiah took back the amount and the faked challan and then the

Inspectors came to the lorry and when challan was demanded, Vengaiah stated that it was not brought. Then the Senior Inspector went to the Weigh-Bridge clerk and verified from the record therein that this lorry was not weighed. Hence the matter was reported to the Colliery Executive Engineer, and the lorry was detained. On the following day statement was recorded from Vengaiah.

7. The two Inspectors corroborated the version of the Watchman to the extent to which they are witnesses. Kasaiah supported the version of Vengaiah. P. Srinivasa Rao, I.E. stated that he had seen this Workman going towards Railway Siding Check-post on a cycle at 6.45 P.M. on 17-2-1978 when he was at the loads yard.

8. This Workman had come with the following version:—On the morning of 17-2-1978 he obtained the oral permission of the concerned Executive Engineer to avail permission on 18-2-1978, as he had to go to Kamalapuram, his native place. Till 5.30 P.M. on that day, the I.E. and CHP were in the Office, and he too was in the Office. Then he went away on bicycle. He took tea at his house and again started at 6.30 P.M. on that day to Godavari Khan Bus Stand to go to Ramagundam Station, and reached Ramagundam Station at 7.00 P.M. There he met M. Eshwar. Both of them left by Kazipet train at 9.30 P.M. He also produced a certificate from Sarpanch in his defence in the enquiry to show that on 18-2-78 he was at his native place.

9. The Enquiry Officer believed the witnesses for Management. He disbelieved the version of Eshwar the witness for the Workman on the ground that there was litigation between the said Eshwar and this Management. Further the Enquiry Officer also felt that even if in fact this Workman went to his native place on that night, it does not affect the version of the Management as the train left at 9.30 P.M. while according to Vengaiah, the arrangement between him and this Workman was finalised at 7.15 P.M. or 7.30 P.M.

10. The learned counsel for the Management contended as follows:—There is nothing to disbelieve the version of the Watchman and the Senior and Junior Inspectors, and this Workman had come up with a belated version that the Senior Inspector had a grudge against him in respect of an incident or incidents said to have happened in 1965 i.e. about 13 years back and it was not even suggested like that to the Senior Inspector. The belated version of the Workman in regard to the grudge against him by the Watchman and also Vengaiah cannot also be believed as the same was not suggested to either of them. The version for the Management clearly shows that the loaded lorry was detained when an attempt was made to take it away without challan, and there is no need either for the Inspectors or for the Watchman to foist a case against this Workman.

11. It was further urged for Management as follows:—The Enquiry Officer rightly disbelieved the version of Eshwar in view of a dispute between him and the Management, and even otherwise if it can be stated that this Workman left for his native place by train at 9.30 P.M. on that day, it does not affect the version of the Management or the arrangement made by this Workman at 7.30 P.M. on that day.

12. It was contended for the Workman as follows:—Though the Junior Inspector stated that even on 17-2-1978 the statement of Vengaiah was taken, it was not filed and so much reliance cannot be placed upon the statement of Vengaiah which was said to have been taken on 18-2-1978 and which was filed in Court. Adverse inference has to be drawn for not filing the earlier statement. Till Kasaiah was examined before the Enquiry Officer, it was not stated that he was with Vengaiah at the time of conversation between Vengaiah and this Workman. Even otherwise the evidence of Kasaiah shows that he is not a reliable witness. So the un-corroborated version of Vengaiah, who is in the nature of an accomplice, cannot form the basis for holding this Workman guilty. The Enquiry Officer was not justified in disbelieving the version of Eshwar, the witness for the Workman simply because there is litigation between him and this Management. This Workman had an unblemished service under this Management for about 14 years. He was in no way concerned with the loading of the lorry. In view of the previous hostility between this Workman and the Senior Inspector, the Watchman, and Vengaiah, this case was foisted against him.

13. The Watchman stated that he did not know this Workman by the time he approached him on 17-2-1978 at 5.00 P.M. But both the Senior and the Junior Inspectors stated that they knew this Workman by 17-2-1978, and they identified him when he had conversation with the Watchman at 7.00 P.M. on 17-2-1978. So if there is no enmity between those Inspectors and this Workman, and if those Inspectors had no oblique motive, then their version can be believed. This Workman admitted that he had no enmity with Junior Inspector, but he stated that the Junior Inspector might have stated falsely to oblige the Senior Inspector who is his superior. The Workman stated at the time of examination by the Enquiry Officer, that in 1965 there was a tussle between him and the Senior Inspector in regard to some incidents, and hence the Senior Inspector bore grudge against him, but he admitted before the Enquiry Officer that he did not complain to anybody. However it is not even suggested like that to the Senior Inspector. So it can be stated that this Workman had come up with a belated version in a vain attempt to see that the evidence of the Senior Inspector is discredited. So in view of the material on record it can be stated that both the Senior and the Junior Inspectors are true witnesses.

14. In regard to the Watchman and Vengaiah, this Workman stated that when he was the clerk of the Weigh-Bridge, those 2 persons asked him to allow them to take coal over and above the coal noted in the permits, and as he had not obliged them, they bore grudge against him. But he had not suggested like that to either of them. Hence it can be stated that the above version of this Workman is belated.

15. It is true that the evidence of Kasaiah does not inspire confidence. If the only material available is the evidence of Vengaiah and Kasaiah, then as it can be stated that the evidence of Kasaiah is not believable on the basis of the un-corroborated version of Vengaiah, who is in the nature of an accomplice, this Workman cannot be held guilty. (It is admitted for Workman that Vengaiah in his evidence referred to only Kasaiah but not Rajaiah).

16. It cannot be stated that the view of the Enquiry Officer that the evidence of Eshwar, the witness of the Workman, cannot be believed on the ground of litigation between him and the Management as perverse. Even the version of the Sarpanch that this Workman was in his village on 18th February, 1978, does not effect the version of the Management for the train left Ramagundam at 9.30 P.M. on 17-2-1978, while this incidence was said to have taken place at 7.30 P.M. on 17-2-78.

17. It is true that if the earlier statements are not filed, then much reliance cannot be placed on the later statements. But in this case, I already observed that if this case has to be considered solely upon the evidence of Vengaiah and Kasaiah, then the Workman herein cannot be held guilty. But I already observed that the two Inspectors are truthful witness, and on the basis of their evidence this Workman can be held guilty.

18. While the Watchman stated that this Workman approached him at 5.00 P.M. and when the Inspectors stated that this Workman had again come to the Watchman at 7.00 P.M. Vengaiah stated that for the first time on that day this Workman called him at 7.15 or 7.30 P.M. Then a doubt arises as to whether the Workman met Vengaiah only after finalising the deal with the Watchman, or whether he approached the Watchman after settling the deal with Vengaiah. I already observed that Vengaiah is in the nature of an accomplice. In his own interest, he might not have come up with entirely true version. So either it might be a case where Vengaiah had come up with wrong version in regard to time and this Workman approached the Workman after settling the deal with Vengaiah, or it might be a case that this Workman after finalising the affair with the Watchman approached Vengaiah and had a deal with him, and Vengaiah might have come with a true version with regard to the time. So when the two Inspectors are treated as truthful witnesses, this aspect also does not affect their version.

19. So in view of the material on record, the finding of the Enquiry Officer can be accepted and I find accordingly.

20. Point 2.—This is a case of taking bribe for abetting theft. Such acts of abetment of theft are admittedly grave offences and so the Management is justified in dismissing this Workman for the above proved charge, even though he had an unblemished service for about 14 years.

21. But the learned counsel for the Workman contended that even if it can be held that the charge is proved, it has to be stated that he might have been a scape goat, and hence it is not proper to impose an extreme punishment of dismissal.

22. It is clear that even the accused stated that he was a weigh-bridge clerk on some days. In such a case, he is familiar with the procedure to be adopted by the customers in taking coal on permit from the Office of this Colliery. Admittedly he was not the weigh-bridge clerk on 17-2-1978. So when he was not the weigh-bridge clerk, and if he was in no way concerned in regard to the delivery of coal, then there is no need for other persons to utilise the services of this Workman in getting the coal sent out of the premises. It is not a case where this Workman was very close with the Watchman. While the Watchman stated that he did not know the name of this Workman by the date of this incidence, this Workman had come up with a belated version that this Workman was enemical to him as he refused to allow this Watchman, who was said to be dealing in coal, to take coal more than what is noted in the permit. So when this Workman was not close with the Watchman concerned, then there was no need for the persons concerned with the delivery of coal to utilise the services of this Workman. Of course without the connivance of some other persons of this Colliery there was no possibility of getting the lorry loaded, when the challan was not produced and when the necessary slip from the weigh-bridge clerk was not issued. Anyhow merely because some other persons connived at the transaction and they were not caught, it is not a ground for taking lenient view against this Workman, when the material on record suggests that he is the brain behind this transaction, and hence I do not find any reason to interfere with the punishment and I find accordingly.

23. In the result, I find that the action of the Management in dismissing this Workman from service is justified and the Award is passed accordingly.

Dictated to the Stenographer, transcribed by him and corrected by me and given under my hand and the seal of this Tribunal, this the 24th day of November, 1980

V. NEELADRI RAO, Presiding Officer

#### APPENDIX OF EVIDENCE

##### Witnesses Examined :

For Workman . . . . . For Management :

W.W. 1 Sri B. Narayana. Nil.

##### Documents Exhibited by the Management :

Ex. M1 Charge sheet dt. 23-2-78 issued by the Management to Sri B. Narayana.

Fx. M2 Reply to the charge sheet submitted by Sri B. Narayana to the Management dt. 24-2-78.

Ex. M3 Management's letter dt. 27-3-78 to Sri B. Narayana  
Ex. M4 Enquiry Proceedings dt. 5-3-78.

Ex. M5 Material Papers filed in Enquiry Proceedings.

Ex. M6 Enquiry report pertaining to Sri B. Narayana.

Ex. M7 Dismissal order dt. 11-6-78 issued to Sri B. Narayana by the Management.

##### Documents Exhibited by the Workman : Nil

V. NEELADRI RAO, Presiding Officer.

[No. L-21012(21)/78-D.IV.B]

New Delhi, the 20th December, 1980

**S.O. 70.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Hyderabad in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Ramakrishnapur Division, Adilabad District (Andhra Pradesh), and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 16th December, 1980.

#### BEFORE THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (CENTRAL) AT HYDERABAD

#### Industrial Dispute No. 8 of 1978

##### BETWEEN :

Workmen of Singareni Collieries Company Limited,  
Ramakrishnapur Division, Adilabad District, A.P.  
AND

The Management of Singareni Collieries Company Limited,  
Ramakrishnapur Division, Adilabad District,  
A.P.

##### APPEARANCES :

Sri A. Lakshmana Rao, Advocate—for the Workmen  
Sri K. Srinivasa Murthy, Hon. Secretary, Federation of  
A.P. Chambers of Commerce and Industry—for the  
Management.

##### AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour, under Sections 7A and 10 (1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 by its Order F. No. 1-21011(1)/77-D IV(B) dated 28th March, 1978 has referred to this Tribunal the following issues for adjudication in the industrial dispute between the workmen and the Management of Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Ramakrishnapur Division, Adilabad District,

"Whether the action of the management of Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Ramakrishnapur Division in asking the Shotfirers Grade 'C' to perform duties of Mining Sirdars in addition to their own and on their refusal to do so not allowing them to perform their normal work with effect from 6th April, 1977 to 19th April, 1977 is justified ? If not, to what relief are the concerned workmen entitled and from what date ?"

2. The reference was registered by this Tribunal as Industrial Dispute No. 8 of 1978 and notices were sent to parties concerned.

3. A joint memo dated 15th October, 1980 was filed by the Workmen and the Management of Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Ramakrishnapur Division praying for passing an award in terms of the settlement. Sri S. Nagi Reddy, President, Tandur Coal Mines Labour Union, Bellampally and Sri D. Subramanian, Divisional Personnel Officer, Bellampally who is permitted to represent the General Manager, Bellampally as per orders in MP., are present today and they admitted the terms of the settlement.

4. After having gone through the terms of the settlement, it can be stated that it is just and proper and it is in the interest of both the concerned workmen and also the Management. Such proper and just settlement have to be accepted in order to see that cordial relationships between the workmen and the management are maintained. Hence, in the circumstances, it is a fit case for passing the award in terms of the Settlement especially when it is stated that Clause 1 of the terms of settlement was already implemented.

5. Award is passed accordingly in terms of the settlement between the parties. Copy of the settlement is herewith attached as part of the award.

Dictated to the Stenographer, transcribed by him and corrected by me and given under my hand and the seal of this Tribunal, this the 18th day of November, 1980.

V. NEELADRI RAO, Presiding Officer

Memorandum of Settlement arrived at under Rule 58(4) of I.D. (Central Rules), 1957 between the Management of Singareni Collieries Company Limited and their Workmen represented by the Tandur Coal Mines Labour Union, Bellampally on 25th April, 1980.

On Behalf of the Management.

1. Sri S. P. Ahuja,  
General Manager,  
Bellampally.

2 Smt P T Thomas,  
Personnel Officer,  
Belampalli

On behalf of Union

- 1 Smt S Nagaish Reddy,  
President TCML Union,  
Bellampalli
- 2 Smt B Venkat Rao,  
Vice President,  
TCML Union Belampalli

#### SHORT RLCITAL OF THE CASE

The Shot Fitter grade C of RK 4 Incline, caused a stoppage of work from 1st shift on 6th April, 1977 alleging that they were asked to perform both the jobs of a Shot Fitter and the Mining Sirdar. The Management's contention was that the management was justified in asking them to perform both the jobs of Shot Fitters and Mining Sirdars as less than 30 persons only were employed at a working place. The strike at RK 4 Incline continued till 18th April, 1977 and spread to other Mines in Ramakrishnapur Division during this period and KK 5 and KK 5A of MM Division also in one shift resulting in loss of output to a tune of 6500 tonnes valued at Rs 4 55,000 at RK 4 Incline and 25 556 tonnes valued at Rs 18 13 520 in the entire Ramakrishnapur Division during the period from 6th April, 1977 to 19th April, 1977. The Labour Machinery intervened and held discussions separately. Ultimately, the matter was referred to the Tribunal and registered as ID 8 of 1978 with a reference as under:

Whether the action of the Management of SC Co Ltd, Ramakrishnapur in asking the Shot Fitters 'C' grade to perform duties of Mining Sirdars in addition to their own and on their refusal to do so not allowing them to perform their normal work with effect from 6-4-77 to 19-4-77 is justified? If not to what relief is the concerned workmen entitled and from what date?

The matter was discussed between the management and the Union at length and to maintain Industrial harmony and cordial relations and it has been agreed as follows:

- 1 The Management agreed to assess the requirement of Mining Sirdars and designate the Shot Fitters 'C' grade as Mining Sirdars depending on their seniority and requirement in the Mines in RKP Division by 1st May, 1980.
- 2 The Management agreed to sort-out the anomalies, if any, of the Shot Fitters and Mining Sirdars of Ramakrishnapur Division.
- 3 The Management and workmen represented by the Union agreed for adjusting the period of strike by Shot Fitters towards any leave available to their credit and the balance to be treated as leave on loss of pay, on application by them.
- 4 The Union accepts this settlement as full and final settlement of their claim filed by the Union before the tribunal in ID 8 of 1978.
- 5 Parties agree to file this settlement before the Tribunal for passing an Award.

Representing Management

Sd/-

1 S P Ahuja,  
General Manager,  
Belampalli

Sd/-

2 P T Thomas,  
Personnel Officer,  
Belampalli

Representing Union

Sd/-

1 S Nagaish Reddy,  
President, TCML Union  
Belampalli

Sd/-

2 B Venkat Rao,  
Vice President  
TCML Union, Belampalli

Sd/-  
2 K V Krishna Rao,  
Clerk,  
Personnel Department, Bpa.

V NEELADRI RAO, Presiding Officer  
Industrial Tribunal  
No L-12011/1/77 D IV B  
S S MEHTA, Desk Officer

आदेश

नं० १८८१, १९ दस्तूर १९८०

का० अ० ७१ वन्द्राय मर्का० का गये हैं। उसके अनुसूची में विनियोग विषय के बारे में दक्षण मज्जे रखने विनियोग विषय के प्रबन्ध मठन सेम्स्ट्रिट ५ आदा० ५ विवाद निवाजका और उक्त विनियोग विषय माना गया है।

ओर वन्द्राय मर्का० उक्त विवाद वा न्यायिनियन के लिये नियोग विषय के बारे में जिनका वर्णन दिया गया है।

अन् वन्द्राय नं० ४४ आदा० ५ विवाद अग्रिमियम् १९४७ (१९४७ ११) की ग्र. ७३ आ० वारा १० की उत्तराय (१) क्र खड (घ) ८० प्रदल जात्ता रा० प्र. १ वरत हा० ८२ आदा० आ० नाला० राव हाग १३। वरता है जिस पाठ्याना० आधारी था। बा० नाला० राव हाग जिनका मध्यालय हटदगवाद में है। और उक्त विवाद का उक्त आधार ग्र. ५ न्यायिनियन के लिये निर्देशन वरता है।

अनुसूची

क्या उपायवन्वत् के में उल्लेख आकाम्पद श्रमिक जिनकी मताएँ प्रभागीय इनीशियर (इकाइया) दर्शकण मध्य रेलवे, विजयवाडा द्वारा आद्यामक विवाद अग्रिमियम् १९४७ की वारा ८० वर्ष के उत्तराया का पालन विवाद नियोग विषय के दो दी गई थी और जिनकी सेवाओं का १०-५-७४ में यथापूर्व वर्ता दिया गया है १०-५-७४ से ५-५-७४ तक की अवधि के लिये विवाद अनुसूची के वर्त्तावाले विवाद है? यदि हा० ता० विवाद सीमा तक?

उपायवन्वत् "क"

- 1 श्री कर्णी जाहने
- 2 श्री पी० रामानंद
- 3 श्री पा० ववट्टेश्वर राव
- 4 श्री व० मन्यनारायण
- 5 श्री क० शिरपथईया
- 6 श्री पा० रामचन्द्र राव
- 7 श्री पा० जाहन
- 8 श्री क० नरामहेश
- 9 श्री बन्दुर काटाया
- 10 श्री पा० अरुण्यान
- 11 श्री क० ववट्टेश्वर राव
- 12 श्री पी० जाहन
- 13 चौ० नाना० नाना०
- 14 चौ० काटेश्वर राव
- 15 श्री गुनाला गर्नी
- 16 श्री एन० यशोदेवम्मा
- 17 श्री व० नाना० नाना०
- 18 श्री डै० नाना० नाना०
- 19 श्री वी० व० मानम्मा
- 20 श्री कला० विमालम्मा
- 21 श्री डै० नाना०
- 22 श्री वी० एलिजाबेथ
- 23 श्री व० काटेश्वरम्मा
- 24 श्री नी० कमलाकर राव

WITNESSES

Sd/-

1 D Subrahmaniam,  
Divl Personnel Officer,  
Belampalli



her, 1975, as amended vide order dated the 28th August, 1976, referred an Industrial Dispute under Section 10 of the I.D. Act, 1947 in the following terms to Industrial Tribunal, Delhi :

Whether the action of the Zonal Manager (North) Food Corporation of India, New Delhi, in terminating the services of Shri Gyan Chand Gulati, Messenger, with effect from 20th June, 1974 (afternoon), is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?

2. On receipt of the reference it was ordered to be registered and usual notices were sent to the parties by Industrial Tribunal, Delhi, whereupon a statement of claim was filed by the workman on 16th January, 1976, whereafter a requisite corrigendum was received and as such a fresh statement of claim was filed on 8th December, 1976 in the meanwhile the Industrial Tribunal, Delhi relinquished charge and the matter under reference was transferred to this Tribunal, in May, 1977 whereupon it was ordered to be registered and notices were again issued to the parties. In pursuance thereof the Management filed its written statement on the 3rd November, 1977 and the replication was filed on 16th February, 1978. Upon the pleadings of the parties the following two issues were framed by me for trial :

1. Whether the reference is invalid as alleged?

2. As in the order of reference.

3. Thereafter the evidence of the parties was recorded and arguments of representatives of the parties were heard and after giving my considered thought to the matter before me I have come to the following findings upon these issues,

4. Issue No. 1 :

As the order of reference would show the dispute is between the Food Corporation of India and their workmen and it has been contended in this behalf by the respondent—Food Corporation of India that it is not an Industry and as such no reference could be made under section 10 of the I.D. Act. It is further alleged that the provisions of I.D. Act are not applicable to the Food Corporation of India and therefore the reference is incompetent. During the course of arguments the I.D. counsel for the Corporation did not press this issue and rather conceded that the Food Corporation of India is an Industry and the provisions of I.D. Act are applicable to it. Even otherwise there was no escape from the conclusion that the Food Corporation of India is an Industry keeping in view the latest pronouncement of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in Bangalore Water Supply & Sewage Board case. Furthermore a reference to definition of appropriate Government u/s 2 of the I.D. Act would itself show that the provisions of I.D. Act are applicable to the Food Corporation of India. Furthermore there is nothing in the Food Corporation Act, 1964 which excludes the operation of Industrial Dispute Act from the Food Corporation of India. From whichever angle the matter may be considered the only conclusion which can be arrived at is that Food Corporation of India is an Industry and is governed by Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 and as such there is no merit in issue No. 1 which is accordingly decided in favour of the workman and against the management. Incidentally it may be mentioned here that it has not been urged that the matter under reference has not been referred by the competent appropriate Government or that no proper demand was raised or that Shri Gyan Chand Gulati is not a workman or that the matter under reference has not been properly espoused.

5. Issue No. 2 :

A perusal of order of reference would show that the reference relates to the termination of the services of Shri Gyan Chand Gulati, a messenger with the Food Corporation of India w.e.f. 20th June, 1974.

6. The contention of the workman is that he was appointed by the Food Corporation of India, Northern Region Office, New Delhi and he joined services on 29th May, 1970 and on completion of his probationary period he was confirmed in 1971 and that his work throughout had been satisfactory and he had been earning his normal yearly increments; that in so far as the workman was indisposed he applied for medical leave w.e.f. 17th June, 1974 and remained on leave upto 22nd June, 1974 but when he reported for duty on 24th June,

1974 (23rd June, 1974 being Sunday) the Zonal Manager (North) where the workman was posted at the relevant time informed the workman that his services had already been terminated w.e.f. 20th June, 1974 (AN) and as such he was not permitted to join duty; that the termination was illegal, unjustified, punitive, wrongful and malafide and the workman was entitled to be reinstated with full back wages.

7. In its written statement it has been contended by the Food Corporation of India that the Food Corporation was not an Industry and as such the present reference was incompetent; that the workman was insolent in his behaviour; that he was irregular in the attendance of his office and was earlier on number of occasions warned for remaining absent without any leave from 17th June, 1974 he had not applied for any leave and as such his services were terminated w.e.f. 20th June, 1974 (AN) and that the services were terminated in pursuance of the powers vested in the Corporation under regulation 19 of the Corporation and as such the termination was valid and justified and the workman was not entitled to any relief.

8. In order to establish his contention the workman has come forward himself as W.W. I apart from tendering into evidence his duly sworn affidavit Ex. W/1 and documents Annexure A to F. During cross examination he has stated that it was incorrect to suggest that his leave record was not satisfactory. It has further been stated by him that it was incorrect that he did not apply for leave well in time according to the rules of service. He has stated that he did not remember if he had received letter Ex. M/1 or Ex. M/2. It is finally stated by him that it was incorrect to suggest that he had not submitted any application for leave on 17th June, 1974 or that he had not submitted any medical certificate either. He has admitted the correctness of Ex. M/3 and endorsement Ex. M. 3/1 on the part thereof to be in his hand writing. Lastly he has denied that he was working during the period of his unemployment.

9. To rebut this evidence of the workman the Corporation has examined Shri S. C. Mukherjee, Deputy Manager (Legal) as M.W. I and he has produced in evidence as affidavit Ex. M.W. 1/1 apart from letter Ex. M.W. 1/2. During cross-examination it would be found that he had not been in the service of the Corporation at the relevant time when the services of this workman were terminated and therefore it is admitted by him that he had no personal knowledge about this matter. It is also admitted by him during cross examination that the workman never worked under his supervision. It is then stated by him that he was dealing with litigation matters since 1977 but he has never dealt the personal or administrative matters. It is admitted by him that whatever communications are received by the Food Corporation of India are entered into central receipt registry and similarly all communications which are sent out of the FCI office or despatched are entered by the concerned division. Regarding this workman he has stated that he has seen the workman only in the zonal office and now in the court. It is admitted by him that the workman was a confirmed employee. He has not been able to deny that the employee Gyan Chand Gulati was paid increments regularly. He had not even brought the personal file of the employee. He has admitted that he had no knowledge to the effect that the workman was ever charged sheeted for his work or for his conduct. It is also admitted by him that there is nothing on the record to show that the conduct or behaviour of the workman was not upto the mark. He has exhibited his ignorance as to the time when the action regarding the termination of the services of this workman was initiated. It is also admitted by him that no service compensation was offered or paid till today to the employee. When cross examination he has stated that he has only heard say evidence of the officials of his office that the workman was running a vegetable shop and preparing envelopes for sale but he had no personal knowledge. Thus from the perusal of the testimony in cross-examination of this witness it is clearly established that this witness had absolutely no personal knowledge about this case and in the face thereof it would be difficult to give any credence to the statement made by this witness in his affidavit Ex. M.W. 1/1. I have perused his affidavit and from the perusal thereof I find that although during cross-examination he has admitted that he had no personal knowledge with regard

to the conduct of the workman or the circumstances of the termination of the services of this workman or other matters connected therewith but strangely enough in the verification of the affidavit he has verified that 'the contents of the aforesaid affidavit are true and correct to my knowledge and belief'. In the face of this contradiction no weight what-so-ever can be placed upon the testimony of this witness. It is nowhere suggested in this affidavit that the knowledge forming the basis of this affidavit Ex. M.W. 1/1 has been derived by him from the office record or on information received. It is also not stated by him that the officer who had terminated the services of this workman had left the service of this Corporation or has retired and strangely enough said officer has not been examined. Thus no reliance can be placed upon the testimony of Shri S. C. Mukherjee, Deputy Manager in this case. He has produced a memorandum Ex. M.W. 1/2 which only shows that the workman had preferred an appeal dated 1st October, 1974 and the same was filed there being no provision relating to an appeal against the termination order passed by this office. This is a document which would not be of such relevance for the purposes of the question referred to this court. In this context it would be appropriate to refer to Ex. M. 1 to Ex. M. 3 which evidenced only that this workman had been availing leave without getting its sanction before availing it.

10. I have already discussed the evidence produced by the Management which does not in any manner validate or justify the order of termination of the services of the workman. I would now like to refer to annexure I which is the original order of termination of the services of the workman and is dated 20th June, 1974 and reads 'under regulation 19 of the Food Corporation of India (staff) Regulation, 1971 the services of Shri Gyan Chand Gulati, Messenger are hereby terminated from 20th June, 1974(AN). He will be eligible to draw 90 days pay in lieu of this notice'. Annexure B is the application dated 23rd June, 1974 submitted by the workman to the Zonal Manager when he was not permitted to resume duty on 24th June, 1974 in which he has reiterated that he was on medical leave w.e.f. 17th June, 1974 to 23rd June, 1974 and he had sent an application through post under U.P.C. and had reported for duty after fitness with fitness certificate. In this letter he has challenged the termination of his services. Ex. Annexure-C is the letter of demand raised by the workman with the respondent sent to the Zonal Manager (North) of the Corporation while Annexure D is the demand notice sent to the Managing Director of the Corporation. Ex. Annexure E is the statement of claim filed before the Conciliation Officer. Annexure F is the minutes of conciliation proceedings held before the Conciliation Officer. All these documents are admitted on behalf of the management which alleges that his services have been terminated as he was allegedly absent from duty without any leave from 17th June, 1974 but the workman has consistently taking up the position that he has sent a leave application on 17th June, 1974 as he had fallen sick and that he had reported for duty together with a medical fitness certificate on 24th June, 1974 when he was informed that as his services had been terminated on 20th June, 1974 vide Annexure A. The contention of the workman that the services have been terminated in violation of all the provisions of the Industrial Dispute Act is clearly established in the instant case. It is clear from the written statement of the Corporation that his services were terminated under rule 19 of the Staff Regulation 1971 because the workman was absent without any leave from 17th June, 1974. Even assuming that the workman was absent from 17th June, 1974 without any leave it was not open to the Corporation to have recourse to rule 19 in the instant case because the alleged absence of the workman was governed by the definition of mis-conduct under the Industrial Employment Standing Orders and as such this absence could have been and should have been a subject of disciplinary action against the workman and could not straightway form a cause of action for action under Regulation 19. It may be mentioned here that under section 3 of the Regulations 1971 Regulation No. 24 item No. VI itself provides that 'an employee wilfully absenting from duty after the expiry of leave shall also be liable to disciplinary action'. Although there is no regulation providing for a disciplinary action for absence from duty without any leave but the same principle which is incorporated in item No. VI referred to above would be applicable in such a case also. It would be similarly appropriate to refer here to item No. 12 of Regulation 24 which provides that an employee who remains absent beyond that

period (5 years continuously) will cease to be an employee of the Corporation. This in the circumstances it was not open to the Corporation to have recourse to regulation 19 and such a recourse in the instant case is a malafide. Reference here may also be made to item No. IV of regulation 24 which further provides that 'in case where an employee is compelled to absent himself from duty on account of foreign circumstance without obtaining prior sanction, sanction for leave should be applied for at the earliest possible opportunity. Obviously sudden illness would be unforeseen circumstance in which case this provision would immediately come into operation and the workman has stated in para 2 of his sworn affidavit that 'as I was indisposed therefore I applied for medical leave w.e.f. 17-6-74 and remained on leave till 22-6-74. Application for leave was sent on 17-6-74 under postal certificate, I joined my duty on 24-6-74 (23-6-74 being Sunday) I had medical cum-fitness certificate with me.' . . . . . it may be mentioned here that it is admitted by M.W. 1 that a receipt register was maintained in the Corporation wherein all receipts are entered but strangely enough neither the said register has been produced nor the Incharge who was maintaining that register has been produced to prove that no such application as referred to had been sent by the workman was ever received in the office of the Corporation on the relevant date. Assuming that the workman was in the habit of absenting himself without his obtaining sanction of the leave even that would form subject matter of a disciplinary action and proceeding against the workman and that fact in itself cannot be sufficient to enable the Corporation to have recourse to Regulation 19 and to terminate the services of the workman. Another important fact which cannot be lost sight of in the instant case is that the workman had not been absent for a unduly long period. On the 4th day of his absence his services were terminated by the Corporation. It appears as if the Corporation was already decided to dispense with the services of the workman on the least pretext and this is what has been done in the instant case. Strangely enough in Ex. M.W. 1/2 it is stated by the Corporation that there was no provisions for any appeal against the order of termination in the instant case, while in its written statement the Corporation has alleged that the regulations provided for an appeal and as no appeal was preferred, this reference is bad. The Corporation cannot blow hot and cold in the same breath. This case has exhibited a very sorry state of affairs in the Corporation. Whereas it was expected that as a Public Corporation it would be a model employer, the conduct of the Corporation in the instant case exhibits nothing but its high handedness in the dispensing with the services of a poor messenger. It has been urged on behalf of the Corporation that the services having been terminated under Rule 19, it was not open to this court to go behind the order, but it has been observed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Gujarat Steel Tubes Ltd. and Gujarat Steel Tubes Mazdoor Sabha—1980(40) FLR-152 that 'Masters and servants cannot be permitted to play hide and seek with the law of dismissals and the plain and proper criteria are not to be mis-directed by terminological cover-ups or by appeal to psychic process but must be grounded on the substantive reason for the orders, whether disclosed or undisclosed. The Court will find out from other proceedings or documents connected with the formal order of termination what the true ground for the termination is, if thus scrutinised, the order has a punitive flavour in course or consequence, it is dismissal. If it falls short of this test, it cannot be called a punishment. To put it slightly differently, a termination effected because the master is satisfied of the misconduct and of the consequent desirability of terminating the service of the delinquent servant, it is a dismissal, even if he had the right in law to terminate with an innocent order under the standing order or otherwise. Whether, in such a case the grounds are recorded in a different proceeding from the formal order does not detract from its nature. Nor the fact that, after being satisfied of the guilt, the master abandons the enquiry and proceeds to terminate. Given an alleged misconduct and a live nexus between it and the termination of service the conclusion is dismissal even if full benefits as on simple termination, are given and non-injurious terminology is used. On the contrary, even if there is suspicion of misconduct the master may say that he does not wish to bother about it and may not go into his guilt but may feel like not keeping a man he is not happy with. He may not like to investigate nor take the risk of continuing a dubious servant. Then it is not dismissal but termination simplicitor, if no injurious record of reasons or punitive pecuniary cut-

back on his full terminal benefits is found. For, in fact, misconduct is not then the moving factor in the discharge. What is decisive is the plain reason for the discharge, not the strategy of a non-enquiry or clever avoidance of stigmatising epithets. If the basis is not misconduct the order is saved.' In the instant case the entire written statement of the Corporation flows on the basis that the services were terminated as the workman was habitually absent from duty and last time absent from duty on 17th June, 1974 and therefore recourse was had to regulation 19. The action in the instant case of the Corporation is clearly punitive and malafide and a camouflage. The alleged absence of the workman could form basis of a disciplinary proceedings against the workman but the Corporation appears to have been ill advised to have recourse to regulation 19 and terminated the services of the workman and in the circumstances the action of the Corporation cannot be upheld and accordingly I hold that the action of the Zonal Manager (North) Food Corporation of India New Delhi in terminating the services of Shri Gyan Chand Gulati Messenger w.e.f. 20th June, 1974 is unjustified.

11. The action would be further illegal on the ground that it has not complied with the requirements of Section 25-F of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947. It has been observed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in its latest pronouncement in Santosh Gupta Vs State Bank of Patiala 1980(40) FLR, 373 that 'retrenchment would include a termination of services of the type involved in the instant case' and essentially if the provisions of Section 25-F have not been complied with the termination would be illegal, unjustified and un-enforceable. It is admitted by M.W. I that certainly in the instant case provisions of Section 25-F were not complied with and no retrenchment compensation was paid to the workman and for that reason also the termination in the instant case is not justified.

12. Coming to the question of relief there is nothing which even remotely suggest that the workman has dis-entitled by his conduct himself from the normal relief of reinstatement with full back wages, particularly in view of his categorical statement that he was un-employed during the period his services have remained terminated, there being no rebuttal by the Corporation, I hold that the workman is entitled for reinstatement with full back wages from the date of his termination of his services.

13. Accordingly it is awarded that the action of the Zonal Manager (North), Food Corporation of India, New Delhi in terminating the services of Shri Gyan Chand Gulati, Messenger with effect from 20th June, 1974(A.N) is illegal, unjustified and not enforceable and the workman is hereby reinstated with full back wages from the date of termination of his services. He would also be entitled to the costs of these proceedings which are assessed at Rs 500.

MAHESH CHANDRA, Presiding Officer

Dated : the 27th November, 1980.

[No. L-42012/21/75-D.II(B)]

A. V. S. SARMA, Desk Officer

नई दिल्ली, 20 दिसम्बर 1980

का० आ० 74--यान् अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 35) की धारा 5 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रबल शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार श्री सोम प्रकाश बंसल को मृद्यु यान निरीक्षक के अधीन निरीक्षक के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[म० ए-12025/3/79-एम 1]  
दिवेन्द्र कुमार जैन, प्रबल सचिव

New Delhi, the 20th December, 1980

S.O. 74.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 5 of the Mines Act, 1952 (35 of 1952), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Som Prakash Bansal as Inspector of Mines subordinate to the Chief Inspector of Mines.

[No. A-12025/3/79-M. I]  
J. K. JAIN, Under Secy.

New Delhi, the 22nd December, 1980

S.O. 75.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal New Delhi, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of State Bank of India, Malerkotla Branch and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 16th December, 1980.

BEFORE SHRI MAHESH CHANDRA, PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, NEW DELHI

I.D. No. 100 of 1980

Camp at : Chandigarh

Shri Nachatar Singh S/o Shri C. L. Bhardwaj, 878,  
Nai Sarak, Chandni Chowk, Delhi. Petitioner

Versus

The Regional Manager, State Bank of India, Region I,  
Sector 17-B, Chandigarh.

PRESENT :

Nemo for the workman  
Shri V. K. Gupta, Asstt, Law Officer of the Bank.

#### AWARD

The Central Government as appropriate Government vide its order No. L-12012/9/80-II. A dated the 20th September, 1980 referred an Industrial Dispute u/s 10 of the I.D. Act, 1947 to this Tribunal in the following terms:—

'Whether the action of the management of State Bank of India (Region-I), Chandigarh in not providing employment to Shri Nachatar Singh, Ex. Guard, Branch Office Malerkotla on and after 6th March, 1976 is justified ? If not, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled ?'

2. On receipt of the reference it was ordered to be registered and usual notices were sent to the parties while none has appeared for the workman for the three hearings the case was fixed. Shri V. K. Gupta has appeared for the Management and he has come forward with the following statement :

#### Statement of Shri V. K. Gupta on S.A.

'In this case the workman has already been offered appointment as a Guard and he is presently working at Sangrur Branch of our Bank and as such the reference has become infructuous.'

3. In view of the statement of Shri V. K. Gupta read in the light of order of reference I do find that the reference has become infructuous. In fact from the conduct of the workman in not appearing also it has shown that he is no longer interested in this reference. In these circumstances it is awarded that the reference has become infructuous and is filed. Parties are however left to bear their own costs.

Further Ordered :

That requisite number of copies of this award may be sent to the appropriate Govt. for necessary action at their end.

MAHESH CHANDRA, Presiding Officer.

Dated : the 29th November, 1980.

[No. L-12012/9/80-D. II(A)]

S.O. 76.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal Bombay, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of United Commercial Bank, Bombay and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 12th December, 1980.

BEFORE SHRI JITENDRA NARAYAN SINGH, PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL No. 2, Bombay

**Reference No. CGIT-2/45 of 1980**

**PARTIES :**

Employers in relation to the management of United Commercial Bank, Mafatlal Centre, 2nd Floor, Nariman Point, Bombay-21

AND

Their workmen.

**INDUSTRY :** Banking

**STATE :** Maharashtra

Bombay, the 1st December, 1980.

**AWARD**

The Government of India, in the Ministry of Labour in exercise of the powers conferred under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 referred the following industrial dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal by order No. L-12012/117/79-D.II.A dated 1-10-1980 :—

"Whether the action of the management of United Commercial Bank in relation to their Kalamb Branch Taluka Ambegaon, District Pune in terminating the services of Shri N. P. Deole, Assistant Cashier with effect from 15-1-1979 is justified ? If not to what relief is the workman concerned entitled".

On receipt of the reference notices were issued to the parties for filing their claim/written statements.

The Bank by its letter dated 29-10-1980 submitted that the reference may be treated as closed since the matter has been amicably settled between the parties by offering fresh appointment to Shri N. P. Deole, the concerned workman. The General Secretary, the Poona Bank Employee's Association, Pune by his letter dated 31-10-1980 addressed to the Ministry and copy to this Tribunal stated that Shri N. P. Deole has now been re-employed as Clerk at Pimpri Branch and he may be allowed to withdraw the dispute.

In the circumstances I have no other alternative but to pass a 'No dispute' award in this reference and give my award accordingly.

Sd./-

**JITENDRA NARAYAN SINGH**, Presiding Officer  
[No. L-12012(117)/79-D.II(A)]

**S.O. 77.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Bombay, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of United Commercial Bank, Pune and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 12th December, 1980.

BEFORE SHRI JITENDRA NARAYAN SINGH, PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL No. 2, BOMBAY

**Reference No. CGIT-2/49 of 1980**

**PARTIES :**

Employers in relation to the management of United Commercial Bank, Pune

AND

Their Workman.

**INDUSTRY :** Banking

**STATE :** Maharashtra

Bombay, the 1st December, 1980.

**AWARD**

The Government of India, in the Ministry of Labour in exercise of the powers conferred under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 referred the following

industrial dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal by order No. L-12012/118/79-D.IVA dated 23-10-1980 :—

"Whether the action of the management of United Commercial Bank, Bombay in terminating the services of Shri S. P. Borde, Typist, Ganeshkhind Road Branch of the Bank with effect from 19-10-1978 is justified ? If not, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled ?"

On receipt of the reference notices were issued to the parties for filing their claim/written statements.

The Bank by its letter dated 13-11-1980 submitted that the reference may be treated as closed since the matter has been amicably settled between the parties by offering fresh appointment to Shri S. P. Borde, the concerned workman. The General Secretary, the Poona Bank Employee's Association, Pune by his letter dated 31-10-1980 addressed to the Ministry and copy to this Tribunal stated that Shri S. P. Borde now been re-employed as Clerk at Pune Camp Branch and he may be allowed to withdraw the dispute.

In the circumstances I have no other alternative but to pass a 'No dispute' award in this reference and give my award accordingly.

Sd./-

**JITENDRA NARAYAN SINGH**, Presiding Officer  
[No. L-12012(118)/79-D.II(A)]

**S.O. 78.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal New Delhi, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Allahabad Bank and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 16th December, 1980.

BEFORE SHRI MAHESH CHANDRA, PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, NEW DELHI

I.D. No. 10 of 1978

In re :

The President,

All India Allahabad Bank Employees' Association, Katariali, Gali, Jaiganj, Aligarh, ...Petitioner

Versus

The Asstt. General Manager,

Allahabad Bank, Hazrat Ganj, Lucknow, ...Respondent

**AWARD**

The Central Govt. as appropriate Govt. vide its Order No. L-12012/94/77-D.II.A. dated the 17th January, 1978 referred an Industrial Dispute under Section 10 of the I.D. Act, 1947 to this Tribunal in the following terms :

"Whether the action of the management of Allahabad Bank in termination the services of Sri Arvind Kumar Gupta, Cash Clerk, Muslim University, Aligarh Branch w.e.f. 3-3-1977 is legal and justified ? If not, to what relief the said workman is entitled ?

2. On receipt of the reference usual notices were sent to the parties whereupon a statement of claim was filed on 5th April, 1978 by the workman side. A written statement was filed on 1st June, 1978 by the Bank and finally replication was filed on 3rd July, 1978 on which date following one issue was framed for trial :

1. As in the order of reference.

3. Thereafter the case was adjourned for evidence of the parties. The workman examined himself as W.W. 1 apart from Shri Jugal Kishore as W.W. 2 while the Bank has examined only M.W. 1 Shri J. N. Malhotra in support of their respective contentions apart from producing certain documents. I have gone through the evidence produced by the parties and have heard their representatives and after giving my considered thought to the matter before me I have come to the following findings :

4. The contention of the workman is that he was initially employed in the service of the respondent-Bank in pursuance of his application dated 18-5-1972 and he continued to work as relieving cash clerk until he was permanently absorbed in the service of the Bank but to his

utter dismay his services were terminated by the Bank under para 522(i) of the Sastry Award on the alleged ground of concealment of qualifications which was illegal and unjustified and as such he was entitled to be reinstated with full back wages.

5. The contention of the Management is that no doubt that this workman was initially appointed in 1972 as a relieving cash clerk but that appointment in the course of time matured into a regular appointment but before such regular appointment the workman had been directed to file an application in which he disclosed his qualification as having passed intermediate examination while in fact he had passed B.A. examination and that if the fact of his having passed B. A. examination had been disclosed by the workman then he would not have been appointed as a regular cash clerk with the Bank in as much as the Graduates were not eligible to apply for such posts and therefore the Bank had terminated his services under para 522(i) of Sastry Award after giving him notice pay etc. and as such termination was valid.

6. The workman as W.W. 1 has supported his statement of claim and has stated that he had passed Intermediate examination of the UP Board at the time when he joined service of the Bank in the year 1975 and thereafter he submitted an application Ex. W/1 in which he mentioned that he had passed Part-I of B.A. from Agra University in 1971 while he has stated that before his temporary appointment in the Bank he was studying in a college but appeared for the B.A. (Pass) in March-April, 1972. He has further stated that he did not know that Graduates were not appointed as Cash Clerks in the Bank and he worked in various branches of the Bank for 3 years in temporary capacity and during this period he found that Graduates were also working as Cash clerks and then he specifically mentioned that S/Shri S. K. Nigam, Anil Kumar and Shri S. K. Sharma were such persons in Mahoba branch of the Bank (Aligarh) and it was thereafter that he had represented for Graduation allowance being paid to him in January, 1976 and when he submitted his representation he was not told anything by the Bank and then he was called to file an explanation by the Bank to which he submitted his reply which he proved to be Ex. W/2. Then he has stated that he had filed in the form Ex. W/3 on the same facts as they existed at the time when he joined temporary service of the Bank in 1972 and therefore he did not mention the factum of his Graduation in the said form as he did not know that Graduates were not employed at the time when he submitted Ex. W/3 and it was only during the office work that he learnt about the inclemencies and therefore he submitted his representation in January, 1976. Then he has stated that there was no malafide on his part to withhold any facts and that if he had known that this would be a disqualification he would have certainly mentioned it in his form Ex. W/3. During cross examination he had admitted that Ex. W/3 was in his handwriting and he had read the proforma before filling it and had also read the declaration at page 6 of the proforma. It is further stated by him during cross examination that he took the written test on 8-12-1974 while his interview was held on 2nd February, 1975 and that he was Graduate at the time of interview.

7. The Bank has examined M.W. 1 Shri J. N. Malhotra, the Establishment Officer of the Bank who has in his statement in chief stated that vacancy was advertised on 19.11.72 for appointment as cashiers and proved the copy of the same to be Ex. M/1 and stated that in pursuance of this advertisement the workman also filed an application and after it was approved Ex. W/3 was got filed from him in which the workman mentioned his educational qualification as Intermediate although he had passed Graduation in 1972 and it was in consequence of his application that he was appointed but for his withholding the information as to his being a Graduate he would not have been appointed. He has further stated that the bank came to know of the factum of his Graduation in 1976 when the workman claimed Graduation allowance vide letter Ex. M/2 and thereupon the bank terminated the services of the workman after giving him three months notice pay. During cross examination it is admitted by this witness that the workman was appointed on temporary basis on 18-5-72 and he was under Graduate at that time and he was posted to a permanent vacancy in 1975 i.e. 22-10-1975. W.W. 2 is Shri Jugal Kishore who

has produced Ex. W.W. 2/1 and Ex. W.W. 2/2 which are photostat copies of the appointment letter issued to Shri Anil Kumar and Shri Shankar Khanna who were Graduates and were appointed as permanent cashiers.

8. In the light of the above evidence produced by the parties it is established beyond any shadow of doubt that the workman had been appointed after he was approved for temporary appointment as a relieving clerk vide letter dated 17-5-1972. The workman has produced copy of the application dated 18-5-1972 in pursuance whereof he was initially appointed as relieving cash clerk. From the perusal of this copy I find that the workman has clearly mentioned in it that he had passed B.A. Part-I examination after having qualified his intermediate examination of the University. The entire claim of the Bank is based upon application dated 14-4-1975 which is Ex. W/3 in which the workman has given in the column for qualification that he had passed matriculation and intermediate examination and has not made any mention of his having passed B.A. examination. However the fact that the workman had taken the test on 8th December, 1974 as stated by him during his cross examination as W.W. 1 and that he was interviewed on 2nd February, 1975 again stated in his cross examination as W.W. 1 have not been rebutted or denied by either M.W. 1. Once this fact is established that this workman had taken the test on 8th December, 1974 and had even been interviewed on 2nd February 1975 any reference to application dated 14-4-1975 Ex. W/3 loses all relevance. The appointment would be deemed to have been in pursuance of written test held on 8th December, 1974 and followed by interview held on 2nd February, 1975. In this context a reference may be made to the statement M.W. 1 Shri J. N. Malhotra in which he has produced a copy of advertisement dated 19-11-1972 published in the National Herald of 19th November, 1972 in which applications were invited. The said advertisement is Ex M/1. A note to this advertisement shows that the applications were to be submitted within 15 days i.e. not later than 4th December, 1972. The regular appointment of this workman was admittedly in pursuance of this notification and application was required to be submitted in pursuance of this notification Ex. M/1 within a fortnight and strangely enough the Bank has not cared to produce the said application. The question arises whether the workman had not disclosed the factum of his having passed B.A. examination in the said application also? Non-production of the said application would go against the Bank and as such it would be difficult for me to accept the contention of the Bank that the Bank had been kept in dark about this workman having passed B.A. examination. The circumstances in which application dated 14-4-1975 Ex. W/3 was got filed in and signed have not been explained. This application has an air of confusion around it in so far as the application in pursuance of notification Ex. M/1 was submitted and has not been produced and the workman had been required to take the test and was even interviewed before the Ex. W/3 was purported to have been signed. Keeping in view all these facts it becomes difficult to accept that the Bank has established that the workman had conceded his having passed B.A. examination when he applied for the post of cash clerk in pursuance of advertisement Ex. M/1. The bank having failed to establish the concealment at the time of his having applied initially it cannot be held that the Bank was justified in terminating the services under para 522(i) of the Sastry Award on the plea that the information furnished in application dated 14-4-1975 Ex. W/3 was incomplete. In any case it is clearly mentioned in application dated 18-5-1972 Ex. W/1 that the workman had passed Part I of B.A. examination. The workman has categorically stated in his statement that Ex. W/10 was the copy of the application which he had submitted before joining the temporary service of the Bank. The bank has not produced the original application and presumption of such non production would be that if the bank had produced such an application it would have gone against the Bank. Similar would be the presumption against the Bank for non production of the application which must have submitted by the workman in pursuance of notification Ex. M/1. In the face of all these facts it would not be possible for me to accept the contention of the Bank. In any case it cannot be accepted that the Bank has established any malafide on the part of the workman in not mentioning his having passed B.A. in the application dated 14-4-1975 which is Ex. W/3.

9. Reference here may be made to para 2 of Ex. M/2 which is the explanation submitted by the workman to the Bank in which it is stated by him that he had already informed about his having passed Graduation to the A.G.M. Lucknow in the last week of September, 1972. Said A.G.M. has not been produced by the bank for reasons known to the Bank. It is also stated him in para 3 of the said explanation Ex. M/2 that in February, 1975 when he was called for second time interview he had attached all copies of certificates and mark sheets as required by their letter. The same also has not been produced by the Bank for reasons known to the Bank. In fact the Bank has not cared to produce the complete service record of the workman except Ex. W/3. The bank is guilty of not producing the best evidence to establish its claim and as such the Bank must fail and I will hold that the Bank was not justified in terminating the services of the workman under para 522(i) of the Sastry Award.

10. Let us consider the matter from yet another angle. The workman has alleged that the Bank has appointed other Graduates as cash clerks which fact is not denied by the Bank in its written statement and which fact is rather established conclusively by the statement of W.W. 2 who has produced copies of appointment letters of at least two persons which are Ex. W.W. 2/1 and Ex. W.W. 2/2 which go to establish that certainly the Bank had been appointing even Graduates. The position of Anil Kumar and Shankar Khanna does not appear to be materially different from the position of this workman Arvind Kumar Gupta and it has not been shown by the Bank that the services of these workmen have been likewise terminated. This all goes to show that the action of the Bank was malafide and partisan also and consequently is more in the nature of victimisation than bonafide and honest exercise of powers vested by para 522 (i) of Sastry Award.

11. Although it has not been agitated in the statement of claim but it has been argued before me that in any case the termination of services of the workman in the instant case tantamounts to a termination in violation of Section 25-F of the I. D. Act, 1947 in so far as requisite compensation u/s 25-F has not been paid to the workman. Certainly of the principle of law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in Santosh Gupta's case goes to show that the termination in the instant case attracted the provisions of Section 25-F and in so far as those provisions have not been contemplated it would follow that the termination is bad in law and is legal and not justifiable.

12. In view of my discussions above, I have come to the conclusion that certainly the termination of services of this workman are illegal and unjustified and void and as such it is awarded accordingly and the workman is entitled to reinstatement. It has not been established that the workman had been engaged gainfully during this period. It is not even so alleged by the Bank. In view of all these facts I hold that the workman would be entitled to full back wages.

13. For my discussions and findings above, it is awarded that the action of the Management of Allahabad Bank in terminating the services of Shri Arvind Kumar Gupta, Cash Clerk, Muslim University Aligarh Branch w. e. f. 3-3-77 is illegal and unjustified and the workman is directed to be reinstated with full back wages. The workman would also be entitled to costs of these proceedings which are assessed at Rs 500.

Further Ordered :

Requisite number of copies of this award may be sent to the appropriate Govt. for necessary action at their end.

MAHESH CHANDRA, Presiding Officer

[No. L-12012/94/77-D II (A)]

Dated. the 25th November, 1980

New Delhi, the 23rd December, 1980

hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Bangalore, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Vijaya Bank Limited Bangalore and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 16-12-80.

#### BEFORE THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL IN KARNATAKA, BANGALORE

Dated this the 12th day of December, 1980.

PRESIDENT :

Sri H. Shanmukhappa, B.A., B.I., Presiding Officer

Central Reference No. 9 of 1978

#### I PARTY

Workmen represented by  
the General Secretary,  
Vijaya Bank Employees'  
Association, No. 67, 2nd Floor,  
Kengal Hanumanthaiah Road,  
Shanthinagar, Bangalore-27

Vs.

#### II PARTY

The Chairman,  
Vijaya Bank Ltd.,  
Administrative Office,  
2, Residency Road,  
Bangalore-560027.

#### APPEARANCES :

For the I Party :—Sri S Krishnajah, Vice President of Bharathiya Mazdoor Sangh, Bangalore.

For the II Party :—Sri R. N. Narasimha Murthy,  
Advocate, Bangalore.

#### REFERENCE

(Government Order No. I-12011/101/78-D. II.A  
dated 7-10-78).

#### AWARD

As per Order No. L-12011/101/78-D.II.A dated 7-10-78 issued in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 7-A read with clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government has referred the following dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal :—

"Whether the proposed action of the management of Vijaya Bank Ltd, Bangalore to transfer Shri H. Subhayya Shetty, President of Vijaya Bank Employees' Association from Administrative Office of the Bank to the Kempegowda Road Branch, Bangalore is justified? If not, to what relief is Shri H. Subhayya Shetty entitled?"

2. In his claim statement, the I Party workman has stated as follows :—

When the II Party came to know that the I Party workman did not join the K. G. Road Branch, they have transferred two persons Varanballi and Krishna Shetty to Planning and Development Department, Administrative Office, Residency Road, Bangalore-25 where the I Party workman is working and further the said two persons have been allowed seats adjacent to the I Party workman. The I Party has further stated that about a few days ago Varamballi attacked him in Hotel Chalukya and a criminal case is pending against Varamballi on the file of Metropolitan Magistrate, Bangalore. The II Party Bank having failed in all the attempts to cause substantial harm and injury to the I Party workman, in a desperate mood, has instructed Varamballi to give a complaint against him putting forth false, baseless allegations so as to give a handle to the Bank to keep the I Party workman under suspension and initiate departmental proceedings against him on the basis of the complaint, and punish him. He has further stated that at this point of time the Bank has determined to victimise the I Party workman; that the acts of the II Party Bank amount to unfair labour practice. The

II Party Bank passed the order transferring the I Party workman in order to interfere with the functioning of the Association with malafide intention to divide the Association and to make other members of the Association leave it and join the newly formed Organisation sponsored at the instance of the Bank. Having contended accordingly, the I Party workman submitted that the proposed transfer order made by the II Party is not justified and the same may be cancelled.

3. In their counter statement the II Party have submitted that the dispute is not maintainable in law as the transfer of the I Party workman cannot be the subject matter of an industrial dispute under the I.D. Act, as the I Party workman is not a workman as defined under the Act and therefore the reference is illegal and this Tribunal has no jurisdiction to adjudicate upon the merits. They have denied that the Association has a membership of about 5000 employees as alleged by the I Party. The II Party management had no hand in the formation of Vijaya Bank Workers Organisation. The I Party workman had been working in the Administrative Officer of the Bank ever since 1969. As exigencies of administration rendered it necessary the I Party workman Subbaiah Shetty was sought to be transferred from the Administrative Office to the Bangalore Branch in Kempegowda Road which is hardly 2 Kilometres from the Bank. The proposed transfer does not in any manner affect the activities of the I Party workman who is said to be the President of the Association, the apprehension raised in this behalf being purely imaginary. The allegation of malafide intention on the part of the management to divide the Association and interfere with its functioning are denied as baseless and false. The averments made in para 7 of the claim statement are denied as incorrect and being irrelevant. There is neither victimisation nor unfair labour practice involved in the proposed transfer of I Party which was done in the interest of administration. Having contended accordingly the II Party submitted that the reference may be rejected.

4. As no additional issues arose from the pleadings, the points of dispute in the Reference were set down for consideration.

5. MW-1 was examined in part on behalf of the II Party and the case was posted for cross examination of MW-1. Exhibits M-1 to M-20 also have been marked on behalf of the II Party.

6. On 11-12-1980, when the case was called the II Party filed a memo stating that without prejudice to the contentions raised in the statement of objection filed by the II Party and without admitting the various allegations made against it in the claim statement by the I Party the II Party submitted that the proposed transfer of the I Party workman from the Administrative Office of the Bank to Kempegowda Road Branch, Bangalore will not be implemented. Having stated accordingly the II Party submitted that the reference does not survive for further consideration, and requested to pass an award accordingly. The I Party's counsel Sri B. V. Puttigowda, who was present has stated that he has no objection for recording the memo filed by the II Party.

7. As contended by the II Party, the reference does not itself survive for adjudication as they have undertaken not to give effect to the order of transfer passed by the II Party in this reference. Therefore, adjudication regarding justification or otherwise of the action of the II Party in transferring the I Party workman does not arise. Accordingly, the following Award is passed :—

#### AWARD

In view of the above, an Award is passed rejecting the reference as the points of dispute has not survived for adjudication. Ordered accordingly. No order as to costs.

H SHANMUKHAPPA, Presiding Officer.

12/12/80

[No. L-12011/101/78-D.II(A)]

**S.O. 80.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, New Delhi, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Union Bank of India, and their workman Shri Mithan Lal

Gupta, which was received by the Central Government on the 12th December, 1980.

BEFORE SHRI MAHESH CHANDRA, PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,

NEW DELHI

I.D. No. 153 of 1977

In re :

The General Secretary,  
Union Bank of India Employees' Union,  
Kharti Baoh,  
Delhi.

...Petitioner

Versus

The Zonal Manager,  
Union Bank of India,  
26-28, D, Block, Connaught Place,  
New Delhi.

..Respondent

#### AWARD

The Central Government as appropriate Government vide its order No. L-12013/122/74-FR III dated the 20th February, 1975 referred an industrial Dispute u/s 10 of the I.D. Act, 1947 to Industrial Tribunal, Delhi in the following terms :

'Is the management of the Union Bank of India, New Delhi justified in reverting Shri Mithan Lal Gupta, Head Shroff, with effect from the 12th October, 1973 and if not to what relief is the said workman entitled ?'

2. On receipt of the reference it was ordered it be registered and usual notices were sent to the parties to appear on 8th April, 1975. A statement of claim was filed on behalf of the workman on 5th May, 1975 whereafter written statement was filed on the 29th July, 1975 and replacement was filed on 25th August, 1975. Upon pleadings of the parties the following issues were framed by Shri D. D. Gupta, Industrial Tribunal, Delhi for trial :

1. Whether the applicant is a workman within the meaning of Sec. 2(S) of the I.D. Act.
2. Whether there is a valid and proper espousal and if not its effect.
3. Whether the reference is not maintainable for the reason that the applicant has been dismissed from service.
4. As in the term of reference.

the case was then adjourned for evidence of the workman. The workman examined three witnesses and produced some documents. Whereafter the Management produced its evidence consisting of M.W. 1 but before any further proceedings could be held by Industrial Tribunal, Delhi the appropriate Government transferred this reference to this Tribunal in July, 1977. In consequence the case was registered a fresh and notices were issued to the parties. After the parties appeared the evidence of the Bank was completed. Later on in July, 1978 it was found that the order of transfer was open to certain objections and as such a fresh order of transfer was passed and in consequence following statements of the representatives of the parties was recorded on 20-7-73 :

Statement of Shri Madan Mohan and S. S. Sethi for the respective parties as also of Shri M. L. Gupta on SA.

We adopt the proceedings so far held by this Tribunal and the case may be proceeded with from the present stage only.

3. After the evidence of the Management was completed the case was adjourned for evidence in rebuttal of the workman. After the evidence of the workman was completed following statement of the workman was recorded on 14-9-79:

Statement of Shri M. L. Gupta on SA

'It is correct that there are about 11 vouchers in 4 bundles produced by way of illustration by this management today which are not signed by me but the fault is with official current department. I might have been busy in the cash department at the time of receipt of cash by cashiers.'

The case was then adjourned for arguments. I have heard the arguments of the Id. representative of the parties and have gone through the file and after giving my considered thought to the matter before me I have come to the following findings upon these issues :

4. The contention of the workman is that he was employed in the then Union Bank of India Limited in 1958 and he was promoted as Head Shroff w.e.f. 1st March, 1971 vide letter dated 14-4-71; that this promotion was subject to six months probation; that the said period of probation was extended with retrospective effect from 1-9-1971 vide letter dated 14-12-1971; that the workman was later issued a letter dated 7-3-72 by the Bank advising him to improve his over all performance but he was neither confirmed nor his probationary period was extended; that all of a sudden after the expiry of one year and seven months of the issue of letter dated 7-3-72 the workman was reverted to the post of Head Cashier category E-cum-Special Assistant; that the said reversion was illegal and invalid as no charge sheet was issued to the workman before this reversion nor any enquiry was held against him; that the demotion of the workman was malafide, arbitrary, illegal and unjustified, that the workman protested against the said demotion vide his letter dated 22-10-1973 which was rejected by the Bank vide its letter dated 8-1-1974; that later on charge sheet dated 28-11-1973 was served upon the workman and enquiry was held and ultimately the workman was dismissed from service; that the workman is entitled to be reinstated to his promoted post and grade w.e.f. the date he was demoted unjustifiably and hence this case.

5. The Management has in its reply contended that the subject matter of the dispute referred to by the Govt. does not amount to an Industrial Dispute as the claimant was reverted from the post of Head Shroff and the post of Head Shroff is the post of an Officer and not the workman; that the dispute had not been validly espoused; that the workman had been dismissed vide letter dated 10-12-1974 as a result whereof the reference has become infructuous. On merits the facts are not disputed except that it is alleged by the Bank that the work of the claimant was not found satisfactory and he did not come up to the standard expected of him as a result whereof he was reverted and later on dismissed from service for charge which were subject matter of an enquiry and it has been urged that the workman was not entitled to any relief in this case.

6. In replication the claimant side has contended that the Head Shroff was also a workman and as such the reference was a valid reference; that the dispute has been properly espoused; that the dismissed from the service is not effected the validity of the reference and the reference has not become infructuous. It is in the light of these respective contentions that these issues have to be determined.

7. Issue No. 1.—The Management has contended that Shri M. L. Gupta was reverted from the post of Head Shroff and the Head Shroff is an Officer of the Bank in Bank's officer cadre and is not a workman and as such any dispute regarding reversion from the post of Head Shroff does not amount to an Industrial Dispute. The fact that Shri M. L. Gupta was promoted to the Bank's officer cadre grade II is conclusively established by Ex. W/2 which is attested true copy of the letter No. STI (28266) dated the 14th April, 1971 whereby Shri Gupta was promoted. This copy has been produced by the workman himself and I have no reason to doubt its correctness. In the very first para thereof it is mentioned in this letter that 'we are pleased to offer you promotion to the Bank's officer cadre Grade II on the terms and conditions of service set out below.' It would be now too late in the day for Shri M. L. Gupta to allege that he was not an officer of the Bank in cadre Grade II at the time when his reversion took place. Merely fact that his duties inter-alia included some such duties which could sometimes be performed or could also be performed by a workman would not in the instant case make any difference what so ever and Shri M. L. Gupta would be treated as an Officer of Grade II in the Bank's service on the day of his reversion. It for the purposes of this reference. It is admitted during cross examination by the workman as W.W. 1 that he had joined duty on promotion on 6-5-71 in Sharaffa Market Branch, Chandni Chowk, Delhi.

In the face of letter Ex. W/2 no other fact would be relevant. Shri M. L. Gupta would be an officer of Grade II in the officer cadre of the Bank at the time of reversion and I hold accordingly.

8. Having held that Shri M. L. Gupta was an officer at the time of his reversion it would follow automatically that no dispute could be raised in respect of reversion of said Shri M. L. Gupta by Shri M. L. Gupta or by the Union under the provisions of Industrial Dispute Act, 1947. My attention has been invited to Workmen Versus Dima Kuchi Tea Estate, 1958-1-LIJ-500-1958-80-SC-353 and Workmen Versus Dahingapali Tea Estate 1958-SC-1026 & All India Reserve Bank Employees' Association Versus Reserve Bank of India-1966-SC-305 on behalf of the workman side but the principle of law laid down in these rulings is not applicable to the present case. Even otherwise the principle laid down in these rulings was that the workmen can raise a dispute against their employer in respect of their employment or non employment of such persons who were not strictly speaking workmen but in which the workmen as a class had a direct or substantial interest. In the instant case no direct or substantial interest of the workmen as a class is involved in the continued employment of Shri M. L. Gupta as an Officer Grade II of the respondent-Bank and that being the position these rulings cannot be of any help to the case of Shri M. L. Gupta in the instant reference. No doubt that the dispute which can validly give rise to a reference under the Industrial Dispute Act need not necessarily be a dispute directly between the employer and its workmen but the workmen cannot take up a dispute in respect of a class of employees who are not workmen and in whose terms of employment those workmen have no 'direct interest' of their own. It is essential that the direct interest must not be a fanciful or remote interest but it must be a 'real and positive interest'. In the instant case Shri M. L. Gupta was promoted on probation as a Grade II officer of the Bank and later on when it was found that he was not a suitable person to be retained as an Officer he was reverted back by order Ex. M/10 and dated 5-10-1973. From the perusal of letter Ex. W/2 or Ex. M/1 it cannot be said that the workmen as a class had any interest what so ever in the continued employment of Shri M. L. Gupta as Head Shroff or in his reversion much less any direct interest and that being the position it cannot be held that the workman in the instant case had a right to raise the present dispute and it would follow that the present dispute does not qualify as an Industrial Dispute within the meaning of Section 2(k) of the Industrial Dispute Act.

9. Let us consider this matter from yet another angle. Suppose Shri M. L. Gupta had not been reverted and rather his services were terminated. Would it be in that event open to Shri M. L. Gupta or the Union to raise any dispute under the I.D. Act, 1947? The answer is obvious and it is that no such dispute could have been raised in the event of termination of the services of Shri M. L. Gupta as Head Shroff. How so ever arbitrary such a termination might have been. If such was the position with regard to his termination it can not be different with regard to reversion it is a different thing that it would be open to Shri M. L. Gupta to challenge his reversion in a different forum and under different provisions of law but he cannot have recourse to the provisions of I.D. Act, 1947 to redress his grievances. My attention has not been drawn to any other ruling on behalf of the workman.

10. In view of my discussions above, issue no. 1 is decided in favour of the Management and against the workman and it is held that Shri M. L. Gupta was not a workman within the meaning of Section 2(s) of the I.D. Act for the purpose of this reference and it is further held that in so far as Shri M. L. Gupta was not a workman when he was reverted the present dispute does not qualify as an Industrial Dispute under section 2(k) of the I.D. Act and as such no reference could be made in respect of the matter under reference and the reference is invalid, incompetent and not maintainable. In view of my discussions and findings upon issue no. 1 I further hold that this Tribunal has no jurisdiction to go into the validity of the reversion of Shri M. L. Gupta under the I.D. Act, 1947 and accordingly it is awarded that Shri M. L. Gupta is not a workman within the meaning of Section 2(s) of the I.D. Act, 1947 for the purposes of this reference and as such the reference in the instant case is not competent and valid and the workman is not entitled to any relief. Parties however are left to bear their own costs.

Further Ordered.—That the requisite number of copies of this award may be sent to the appropriate Govt. for necessary action at their end.

Dated : the 24th November, 1980

MAHESH CHANDRA, Presiding Officer  
[No. L-12012/122/74-D.II(A)]

**S.O. 81.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal New Delhi, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of State Bank of India and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 16th December, 1980.

BEFORE SHRI MAHESH CHANDRA, PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, NEW DELHI

I.D. No. 10 of 1980

In re : Camp : At Chandigarh.

The Dy. General Secretary, State Bank of India Staff Association (Regd.), 33, Bank Enclave, Rajouri Garden, Ring Road, New Delhi-110018.—Petitioner  
Versus

The Regional Manager, Region III, State Bank of India, C. R. M. Office, Section-17, Chandigarh.—Respondent.

PRESENT :

None—for the workman.

Shri V. K. Gupta, Asstt. Law Officer of the Bank.

#### AWARD

The Central Government as appropriate Government vide its order No. L-12012/10/79/D.II.A dated the 23rd February, 1980 referred an Industrial Dispute u/s 10 of the I.D. Act, 1947 in the following terms to this Tribunal :

Whether the action of the Management of State Bank of India (Region III), Chandigarh in stopping one annual increment with cumulative effect of Shri Suresh Kumar Chhabra, Clerk at Branch Office Hissar of the Bank is justified in view of the findings of the Enquiry Officer ? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to ?

2. On receipt of the reference usual notions were sent to the parties in pursuance whereof statement of claim was filed by the workman side to which a written statement was filed by the Bank and finally a replication was filed on behalf of the Bank. The case was then adjourned for filing of documents by the parties but no documents were filed. Thereupon talks for compromise started between the parties and the case was adjourned to today. Today none has appeared for the workman side while Shri V. K. Gupta appeared for the Bank. In these circumstances ex-parte proceedings were ordered against the workman side and it was ordered that ex parte evidence of the Bank be recorded. Rather than producing its ex parte evidence Shri V. K. Gupta, the representative of the Bank came forward with the following statement :

Statement of Shri V. K. Gupta, representative of Bank on S.A.

'I tender into evidence the documents on record Ex. M/1 to Ex. M/6. In view the fact that bank has prepared to take lenient view of the matter bank has no objection to release the increment w.e.f. date of this award. Award releasing increment w.e.f. today be made. I close my evidence.'

3. I have given my considered thought to the matter before me and after hearing Shri Gupta, I have come to the following findings .

4. The contention of the workman in this case is that he was punished with stoppage of one increment with cumu-

lative effect on account of some alleged misconduct which stoppage was not justified. On the contrary it has been urged on behalf of the Bank that the punishment of stoppage of one increment with cumulative effect was imposed upon the workman after requisite show cause notice and charge sheet. The documents have been tendered into evidence by Shri Gupta. From the perusal of the documents produced on record I find that Ex. M/6 is the findings of the Enquiry Officer. From last para thereof I find that the Enquiry Officer had come to the conclusion that the Bank has not been able to prove beyond doubt that the instrument was lost from the custody of the employee. On the other hand it appears to have been misplaced from the section. Accordingly, I exonerate the employee from the charge levelled against him.' In the face of this finding for the Regional Manager to still inflict the punishment upon the workman. The action of the Regional Manager in inflicting the punishment inspite of exonerating of the employee by the Enquiry Officer is against all canons of natural justice and no case has been made out on behalf of the Bank so as to enable me to hold that the order of Regional Manager was justified. In view thereof I come to the conclusion that the action of the Management of State Bank of India, Region III, Chandigarh in stopping one annual increment with cumulative effect of Shri Suresh Kumar Chhabra, clerk at Branch Office Hissar of the Bank is not justified and he is entitled to be restored his increment and accordingly the increment is restored from the date it would have otherwise fallen due. Accordingly it is awarded that the increment of the workmen is restored from the date it would have normally fallen due and he would also be entitled to the arrears of his wages as a consequence of release of his increment. There is no order as to costs as the order is ex parte.

Further Ordered.—That requisite number of copies of this award may be sent to the appropriate Govt. for necessary action at their end.

Dated : the 29th November, 1980 (At Chandigarh).

MAHESH CHANDRA, Presiding Officer.  
[No. L-12012/10/79-D.II.(A)]

**S.O. 82.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Madras, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Central Bank of India, Madras and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 6th December, 1980.

BEFORE THIRU T. SUDARSAIAM DANIEL B.A., B.L. PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, MADRAS.

(Constituted by the Government of India)  
Thursday, the 20th day of November, 1980

#### Industrial Dispute No. 68 of 1980

(In the matter of the dispute for adjudication under section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 between the workmen and the Management of Central Bank of India, Madras-6.)

#### BETWEEN

The workmen represented by :

The General Secretary, Central Bank of India Staff Union, No. 1, P. Subramaniam Road, T. Nagar, Madras-17.

#### AND

The Assistant General Manager, Central Bank of India, 159, Greams Road, Madras-6.

#### REFERENCE :

Order No. I-12011/74/79-D.IIA, dated 20-9-1980 of the Ministry of Labour Government of India

This dispute coming on this day for final disposal in the presence of Thiru P. Sundara Sivudu, President of the Union for workmen and of Thiruvalargal S. Sampath Kumar and V. Balasubramanian, Advocates for the Management upon perusing the reference and all other papers connected to this

72  
dispute and the President of the Union having filed a memorandum that this reference may be cancelled and recording the same, this Tribunal made the following.

### AWARD

This is an Industrial Dispute between the workmen and the Management of Central Bank of India, Madras referred to this Tribunal for adjudication under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 by the Government of India in Order No. L-12011/74/79-D.II(A), dated 20-9-1980 of the Ministry of Labour, in respect of the following issue :

"Whether the action of the management of Central Bank of India in relation to their Branch at Madras, in not treating Shri P. Selvaraj (appointed 1-12-75) on probation with effect from their dates of appointment and in not confirming them after the expiry of probationary periods, is justified? If not, to what relief are the workmen concerned entitled?"

(2) Parties were served with summons. The case was posted to 7-10-1980 for filing claim statement. The Union representative took time till 30-10-1980 for filing claim statement. Then time was extended for filing claim statement to 20-11-1980.

(3) Today, when the dispute was called, no claim statement has been filed. But the Union representative filed a memorandum that in view of the representation made by the Union to the Government regarding some discrepancy in the order of reference in this dispute, a fresh reference was issued to this Tribunal which has been taken on file under I.D. No. 83 of 1980 and that in view of the fresh reference in I.D. No. 83 of 1980, the reference in this dispute may be cancelled.

(4) In view of the memo filed by the Union and the fact that this reference has been cancelled by the Government of India in a subsequent reference which form I.D. No. 83 of 1980 on the file of this Tribunal, Award is passed closing the reference. No cost.

Dated, this 20th day of November, 1980.

F SUDARSHANAM DANIEL, Presiding Officer  
[No. L-12011(74)/79-D.II(A)]

S K. BISWAS, Desk Officer.

नई दिल्ली, 23 दिसम्बर 1980

का० आ० 83 --केन्द्रीय सरकार ने यह समाधान ही जाने पर कि  
सोशलिट में ऐसा पारंपर अपेक्षित था, औद्योगिक विश्वाद अधिनियम, 1947

(1947 का 14) का धारा 2 के खंड (d) के उपवाच (IV) के उपवाचों के अनुसरण में भारत सरकार के अम मवालिय की अधिसूचना संघरा का० आ० 1820 नार्टर्स 23 जून, 1980 द्वारा उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 2 के खंड (d) में योगापरिभाषा के वैकाग कंगनी द्वारा चलाए जा रहे वैकाग उद्योग को उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजनों के लिये 29 जून, 1980 से इस सारा की कालावार्ध के लिये लोक उपरोक्त सेवा घोषित किया था ;

ओर केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि लोकर्हन में उक्त कालावार्ध को छः मास की ओर कालावार्ध के लिये घोषित किया जाना अपेक्षित है,

प्रा० अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) का धारा 2 के खंड (d) के उपवाच (IV) के परन्तुक धारा प्रदत्त धार्तों का प्रयाप करते हो, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त उचाव का उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजनों के लिए 29 दिसम्बर, 1980 से छः मास का ओर कालावार्ध के लिये लोक उपरोक्त सेवा घोषित करतों है।

[फाइल सं० पृ० 11017/11/79-डा०] (ग)

प्रा० के० नारायण, अश्व सचिव

New Delhi, the 23rd December, 1980

**S.O. 83.**—Whereas the Central Government having been satisfied that the public interest so required had, in pursuance of the provisions of sub-clause (vi) of clause (n) of section 2 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), declared by the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour No. S.O. 1820 dated the 23rd June, 1980 the Banking Industry carried on by a Banking Company, as defined in clause (b) of section 2 of the said Act to be a public utility service for the purposes of the said Act, for a period of six months, from the 29th June, 1980;

And whereas, the Central Government is of opinion that public interest requires the extension of the said period by a further period of six months;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by the proviso to sub-clause (vi) of clause (n) of section 2 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby declares the said industry to be a public utility service for the purposes of the said Act, for a further period of six months from the 29th December, 1980.

[F. No. S-11017/11/79-D. I. (A.)]

L. K. NARAYANAN, Under Secy.